

Appendix

\* The following are appendices to, but not a part of 310 CMR 10.00

PREFACE TO WETLANDS REGULATIONS RELATIVE  
TO PROTECTION OF WILDLIFE HABITAT

1987 REGULATORY REVISIONS

I. INTRODUCTION

Under a recent amendment (St. 1986, c. 262) to the Wetlands Protection Act, M.G.L. c. 131, § 40, wildlife habitat is added to the interests protected by M.G.L. c. 131, § 40. Wildlife habitat is defined in M.G.L. c. 131, § 40 to mean:

"those areas subject to (M.G.L. c. 131, § 40) which due to their plant community composition and structure, hydrologic regime or other characteristics, provide important food, shelter, migratory or overwintering areas, or breeding areas for wildlife."

Pursuant to the rulemaking authority set forth in M.G.L. c. 131, § 40, the Department of Environmental Protection is promulgating additional regulations, after public comment, to protect this additional interest.

II. THE RULEMAKING PROCESS

During the entire period that its proposed regulations were in preparation, the Department had the benefit of advice and consultation from knowledgeable groups and individuals, most particularly representatives from the development and environmental communities, as well as wildlife and wetland scientists. Where consensus was attained and deemed consistent with the Department's responsibilities under M.G.L. c. 131, § 40, the proposed regulations reflected it; in other instances, the Department weighed conflicting points of view and chose a course of action that in its judgement best served both the public interests identified in M.G.L. c. 131, § 40 and private property rights. The proposed regulations were then subject to public comment at four Public Hearings held around the state, as well as through extensive written submittals. These comments were carefully weighed by the Department and, in many cases, incorporated into a revised version of the regulations. As required by M.G.L. c. 131, § 40, these regulations were submitted to the Clerk of the Massachusetts House of Representatives for forwarding to the Joint Committee on Natural Resources, 60 days prior to their filing with the Secretary of State for final promulgation. The effective date of these regulations is November 1, 1987.

To briefly summarize the lengthy process by which the regulations were prepared; in the 1986 amendment to M.G.L. c. 131, § 40, the Legislature mandated the establishment of a technical advisory committee ("TAC") consisting of a university wildlife biologist; staff members from the Department of Fisheries, Wildlife & Environmental Law Enforcement, Department of Public Works, and Office of Coastal Zone Management; a member of the Massachusetts Homebuilders Association; a member of the Massachusetts Association of Conservation Commissions; a member of the Massachusetts Audubon Society; a member of the National Association of Industrial Office Parks, Boston Chapter; and a general contractor, to advise and assist the Department in drafting proposed regulations. Numerous meetings of the TAC were held to discuss key policy issues. In addition, a six person Scientific Advisory Subcommittee was formed to identify the wildlife habitat characteristics and functions of each wetland resource area, upon which scientific information the proposed regulations were based. Many other scientists, consultants and individuals were contacted informally by the Department during this time period for their advice and opinions.

The Department proposed regulatory revisions on May 5, 1987, and held three Informational Meetings around the state to explain the draft regulations on May 12, 14 and 19; four Public Hearings to receive public comment orally on May 26 and 28 and

June 2 and 4; and accepted written comments from the public on the proposed regulations until June 12, 1987. The regulations reflect the benefit of these comments.

10.00: continued

### III. THE GENERAL APPROACH

The regulations are based on a number of important principles. The Department has attempted to keep the regulations from being overly burdensome, complex or expensive for conservation commissions and applicants, especially for small projects with minor effects on wildlife habitat. No new fees are proposed in these regulations. The Department has also tried wherever possible to maintain the existing regulatory structure, except where protection of wildlife habitat requires procedures which are not needed to protect other interests alone. Most importantly, the regulations are based on the definition of wildlife habitat contained in M.G.L. c. 131, § 40 (see "I. INTRODUCTION" to this Preface).

Prior to enactment of the wildlife amendment to M.G.L. c. 131, § 40 by the Legislature, the Department and most of the other interest groups which were party to the legislative debate agreed to the "intent" of a "preamble", "explaining the effect of this amendment upon the Wetlands Protection Act." Although not legally binding, the Department believes that this "preamble" represents an accurate interpretation of the statutory language (especially the statutory definition of "wildlife habitat") as well as the legislative intent. Consequently, the Department has drafted these regulations to be fully consistent with this "preamble", which is quoted as follows in its entirety:

It is important to make clear what it means to have added the wildlife habitat interest as an eighth interest in M.G.L. c. 131, § 40. It does not mean that the geographic jurisdiction of the conservation commission or the DEP is increased. The resource areas that are protectable under this statute stay the same, only the reasons for their protection are different by adding this wildlife habitat value. In other words, this amendment does not make M.G.L. c. 131, § 40 a wildlife habitat protection statute. It is still a wetlands protection statute. The presence of wildlife habitat on upland (with no resource areas) does not give the conservation commission or the DEP power to control the work therein not altering resource areas.

The addition of the wildlife habitat interest likewise does not change the work or activities that are regulatable under the statute. There still must be dredging, filling, removing or altering of a resource area to trigger jurisdiction of the conservation commission or DEP. In other words, the amendment does not increase the scope of activities regulatable, but rather adds another reason for the conservation commission or the DEP to ask for information about the work and set conditions.

The addition of the wildlife habitat interest also does not change the role or authority of the conservation commission or the DEP in regard to work in the buffer zone. The applicant still has his option to file either a Request for Determination (RFD) or full application (NOI) and the issuing authority still has the task of deciding if the proposed work will alter resource areas. Commissions still may issue negative determinations if satisfied that precautions in the project have been taken so that there will be no alteration of resource areas. In other words, work in a wildlife habitat found in the buffer zone (not altering resource areas) does not trigger jurisdiction to require a full Notice of Intent.

The addition of the wildlife habitat interest does not mean that the mere presence of wildlife in a resource area is enough to establish habitat value. An amendment to the bill during passage makes clear that something else is necessary, namely the presence of a 'plant community composition and structure, hydrologic regime, or other characteristic' providing significant features for wildlife. In other words, the amendment does not mean that there is a wildlife habitat value to the resource area just because some creatures have been seen there. Instead it is the presence of plant community, hydrologic or other characteristics that is determinative. The statute protects habitat value not wildlife *per se*.

10.00: continued

Furthermore, the presence of these characteristics establishing wildlife habitat does not mean that it is automatic that every resource area is significant to wildlife habitat.

The amendment to the bill during passage makes it clear that the features present must be enough to 'provide important food, shelter, migratory or overwintering areas, or breeding areas for wildlife.' In other words, the definition of wildlife habitat sets a threshold for a resource area to be significant for wildlife habitat. It must be significant for the particular reasons stated in the definition: food, shelter, migratory or overwintering areas, or breeding areas.

Each point in this "preamble" is reflected in these regulations. The geographical jurisdiction of the regulations is in no way increased beyond the resource areas as previously defined, despite the urging of many individuals and organizations that the Department extend the regulations to cover all "vernal pool" amphibian breeding areas, even those outside current resource areas. The regulations do not change any rules regarding uplands or buffer zones, nor do they "increase the scope of activities regulatable".

Most importantly, the regulations follows a strict interpretation of the statutory definition of "wildlife habitat", consistent with the agreement expressed in the preamble.

Unlike the other interests protected under the M.G.L. c. 131, § 40, the term "wildlife habitat" is defined in the legislation. Wildlife habitat means those resource areas which, due to certain physical characteristics, provide "important" wildlife habitat functions (*i.e.*, "important food, shelter, migratory or overwintering areas, or breeding areas for wildlife"). Thus while resource areas are presumed to be significant to the protection of other interests whenever they play a role in protecting the interest, a particular site must play a role in providing important wildlife habitat functions, and must do so because of the presence of specific physical habitat characteristics, in order to warrant a presumption of significance under the new wildlife regulations.

The regulations specify what these physical habitat characteristics are and what are (and are not) to be considered "important" wildlife habitat functions in each resource area. This information is reflected throughout the regulations: in the "Preamble", "Presumptions of Significance" and "Performance Standard" contained in the regulations for each resource area, as well as in the special provisions for "rare" wildlife species (310 CMR 10.37 and 10.59) and, for inland resource areas, in 310 CMR 10.60 "Wildlife Habitat Evaluations". The Department furthermore intends to amplify upon the complex wildlife habitat characteristics and functions of resource areas through additional policy guidances. It is only for specified habitat characteristics and the "important" wildlife habitat functions they serve, that presumptions of significance and performance standards are to be applied. These provisions reflect the following understanding of the statutory definition of wildlife habitat:

A. By limiting the definition of wildlife habitat to include only those areas which "due to (certain physical) characteristics" provide "important" wildlife habitat functions, the Department believes the Legislature meant to protect only those wildlife habitats which, though they may sometimes be present elsewhere, are particularly prevalent and/or valuable in wetland resource areas. The scientific literature indicates that virtually everything, except concrete, provides habitat for at least some wildlife species, yet the Department does not believe it was the intention of the Legislature to protect lawns, cemeteries, golf courses, landfills, or wildlife habitats which typify "upland" areas, just because they happen to be located in wetland resource areas. Based on detailed scientific assessments of the wildlife habitats found in each resource area, certain resource areas (or portions of resources areas) which are generally lacking in special wetland wildlife habitat characteristics and functions, are not presumed in the regulations to be significant to the protection of wildlife habitat. For those resource areas which are presumed significant, only specified wildlife habitat characteristics and functions are protected.

10.00: continued

B. By requiring the protection only of "important" wildlife habitat functions (rather than wildlife, per se), the Department believes the Legislature did not intend for the Department to try to save every food source, breeding site, etc. for each individual animal. Instead, the Department believes the Legislature meant to protect wetland habitat which is important to wildlife from a regional or statewide perspective. Therefore, the regulations allow alteration of small amounts of wildlife habitat in most resource areas. For those portions of inland resource areas found to be significant to the protection of wildlife habitat (except bordering vegetated wetlands), the regulations reflect the Department's conclusion that small, one time alterations of up to 10% of the remaining wetland wildlife habitat on a given lot will not harm "important" wildlife habitat functions, and that temporary disruptions of other wildlife habitat is permissible so long as its important wildlife habitat functions are substantially restored or replicated. Certain "water dependent" projects (which the Department believes will be relatively uncommon in inland areas as compared to coastal areas) may also be allowed to proceed at the discretion of the issuing authority under a reduced performance standard without major impacts on "important" wildlife habitat functions of wetland resource areas in the Commonwealth. Because most "important" wildlife habitat in coastal areas is more limited than that in inland areas, the Department has only set a reduced performance standard in some coastal resource areas for "water-dependent projects", those uses and facilities which require direct access to, or location in coastal waters and which therefore cannot be located away from such waters. By requiring such projects to minimize adverse effects on wildlife habitat, while allowing most other projects (no matter how small) to have no adverse effect, "important" wildlife habitat functions of coastal resource areas will be adequately protected. However, because wetland wildlife habitat of rare, officially "state-listed" species is always "important" in both coastal and inland areas, the regulations permit no adverse effects whatsoever on this habitat.

Another alternative for protecting "important" wildlife habitat functions would have been to protect only those specific sites which are of a "high" value for wildlife. The Department considered, but ultimately rejected this alternative. Unfortunately, what is excellent habitat for one species is frequently inadequate for another. For this and other reasons, scientists are currently incapable of setting objective standards for rating the relative value to all wildlife (mammals, reptiles, birds, and amphibians) of sites within most wetland resource areas. Furthermore, without a comprehensive survey of all wetland wildlife habitat in the state (which would be prohibitively time-consuming and expensive), it would be impossible to design a cut-off point for determining when a site is or is not of sufficiently high value to be considered "important". Instead, the regulations generally require no adverse effects on all the "important" wildlife habitat functions existing at each project site (except for certain small alterations or specified project types in some resource areas). Those sites providing few valuable wildlife habitat functions will simply have less to protect than sites that are rich in important wildlife habitat functions.

C. By not defining the term "wildlife", the Department feels the Legislature intended that no preference be given to any particular wildlife species over any other. Consequently, the regulations protect equally all mammals, birds, reptiles, and amphibians for which a resource area provides important wildlife habitat functions. Fisheries (except for specified "rare" species) are not directly protected by most of the regulatory revisions, because current regulations already contain provisions protecting fisheries. Since the habitat needs of most invertebrates overlap those of vertebrate wildlife and fisheries, the Department felt it was not necessary to set separate standards to protect invertebrates, unless they are officially designated rare species in need of special protections. Furthermore, the goal of protecting all wildlife species equally led the Department to promulgate regulations which, within certain limits, require the maintenance of existing wildlife habitat characteristics and functions, rather than allowing development projects to substitute habitat characteristics which, while perhaps helping some species, could harm others.

10.00: continued

#### IV. SUMMARY OF WILDLIFE REGULATIONS

A. Presumptions of Significance. A presumption is created that the following coastal resource areas are significant to the protection of wildlife habitat: Land Under Water; Coastal Beaches; Coastal Dunes; Barrier Beaches; Rocky Intertidal Shores; Salt Marshes; and Land Under Salt Ponds. Presumptions of significance are also made for all inland resource areas, though only for portions of Land Subject to Flooding. For Bordering Land Subject to Flooding, only those areas are presumed significant which have not been extensively altered by human activity; furthermore, except for vernal pool habitat (which is critical to certain amphibians), the presumption is limited to areas on the 10-year floodplain or within 100 feet of the bank or bordering vegetated wetland (whichever is further from the water body). Within isolated Land Subject to flooding, only vernal pool habitat is presumed significant to the protection of wildlife habitat. Vernal pools are presumed to exist, however, only when certified and mapped by the Massachusetts Division of Fisheries and Wildlife.

Like the presumptions of significance found in current regulations regarding other interests protected by M.G.L. c. 131, § 40, presumptions regarding wildlife habitat are generalizations based on a generic study of each resource area. (As noted above, however, unlike presumptions of significance regarding other statutory interests, presumptions regarding wildlife are predicated on a statutory definition which requires the presence of certain physical characteristics providing important wildlife habitat functions.) The prima facie force of the presumption can be overcome by the introduction of sufficient evidence to the contrary; that is, by a showing that the resource area in question functions atypically.

B. Performance Standards. For coastal resource areas, little or no change in performance standards are made for Dunes, Salt Marshes or Land Under Salt Ponds. This is because existing standards for fisheries and other interests protected by M.G.L. c. 131, § 40 are generally adequate to protect wildlife habitat as well. Only minor changes are made in performance standards for water-dependent projects on Land Under the Ocean, Coastal Beaches, Barrier Beaches, and Rocky Intertidal shores. New, stricter performance standards, however, are set for non-water-dependent projects in these resource areas. Such projects may have no adverse effects on specified wildlife habitat characteristics.

In addition, conservation commissions or the Department may allow maintenance, repair, and/or improvement (but not substantial enlargement) of certain projects such as existing roadways, structures and road drainage facilities in coastal resource areas, subject to whatever conditions are deemed appropriate.

For all resource areas (coastal and inland), no project may have any adverse effect on the local population of a rare, "state-listed" vertebrate or invertebrate animal species, where the project is located within the habitat of such species. These habitats are only presumed to exist where mapped by the Massachusetts Natural Heritage and Endangered Species Program. These areas make up only a small percentage of the land subject to these regulations.

For inland resource areas, no changes in performance standards are made for bordering vegetated wetlands (with the exception of special provisions for rare, state-listed species, described above), because existing performance standards allow no large scale alteration of such wetlands, and even small alterations (under 5,000 sq. ft.) must be replicated. For other inland resource areas, project size "thresholds" of 10% of the wildlife habitat on each lot (with a maximum threshold on each lot of 50 feet of Bank and 5,000 sq. ft. of Land Under Water and Land Subject to Flooding) are established, below which projects are allowed without being considered to impair their capacity to provide important wildlife habitat functions. Such thresholds do not apply to critical "vernal pool (amphibian) habitat" on Land Subject to Flooding. Moreover, once this threshold of the wildlife habitat on a lot has been altered

10.00: continued

after November 1, 1987, all future projects on that lot (no matter how small) must meet the same performance standard as applies to larger (above-threshold) projects: no adverse effects on wildlife habitat. This performance standard (which applies to inland Banks, Land under Water, and those portions of Land Subject to Flooding found to be significant to the protection of wildlife habitat) forbids alterations of specified habitat characteristics found at the site, insofar as such alterations will after two (2) growing seasons substantially reduce the pre-project habitat value. Applicants must present evidence from a wildlife biologist or similar professional that this standard will be met. Replication of altered habitat off-site is permitted, but under a number of strict conditions.

Just as the regulations impose less stringent performance standards regarding protection of wildlife habitat on "water-dependent" projects in coastal resource areas, the new inland regulations establish a "limited project" status for water-dependent uses. As with other limited projects in inland resource areas, the normal performance standards are suspended and the issuing authority may issue an Order of Conditions along with "such conditions as will contribute to the interests identified in M.G.L. c. 131, § 40" for water-dependent uses. However, unlike other limited projects these uses remain subject to the existing performance standards for bordering vegetated wetlands, flood control and storm damage prevention, and they must minimize adverse impacts on other statutory interests for which each affected resource area is found to be significant. This new limited project status was deemed necessary by the Department in light of the significantly stronger performance standards being imposed on most larger projects by the new wildlife habitat regulations.

#### V. ISSUES OF MAJOR CONCERN

Public comment on the Department's proposed lower wetlands/wildlife regulations was extensive. While most commentators generally supported the proposed regulations, there were also many suggested changes. The following represents a summary of the most common issues of major concern, and the Department's response thereto as reflected in the final regulations:

A. Presumptions of Significance. There was some strenuous opposition to the establishment of presumptions of significance regarding protection of wildlife habitat, based largely on the language of the last paragraph of the "preamble" agreed to by numerous interest groups (as well as the Department) prior to the legislative enactment of the wetlands/wildlife amendment in 1986. Although this paragraph of the preamble does not explicitly state that the signatories agreed that the Department would not extend its practice of the use of presumptions of significance to the new wildlife habitat interest, these commentators argued that such a result was implied by the statement, "Furthermore, the presence of these characteristics establishing wildlife habitat does not mean that it is automatic that every resource area is significant to wildlife habitat."

The Department believes that a reading of the entire paragraph of the preamble makes it clear that this language does not suggest that resource areas should not be presumed significant to the protection of wildlife habitat, but only that presumptions must be based strictly on the presence of certain physical habitat characteristics providing specified "important" wildlife habitat functions in each resource area:

Furthermore, the presence of these characteristics establishing wildlife habitat does not mean that it is automatic that every resource area is significant to wildlife habitat. The amendment to the bill during passage makes it clear that the features present must be enough to 'provide important food, shelter, migratory or overwintering areas, or breeding areas for wildlife.' *In other words, the definition of wildlife habitat sets a threshold for a resource area to be significant for the particular reasons stated in the definition: food, shelter, migratory or overwintering areas, or breeding areas.* (emphasis added)

10.00: continued

As noted in detail above, this is exactly what the Department has done in creating the presumptions contained in these regulations and certain thresholds below which wildlife habitat functions are irrebuttably deemed not to be important (with the exception of rare species habitat). As with presumptions of significance regarding all other statutory interests, the presumption for wildlife habitat is based on scientifically supported generalities regarding each resource area, and may be overcome by clear evidence that a specific project site acts atypically.

B. Expansion of Jurisdiction. Certain parties suggested that the proposed regulations expanded the jurisdiction of the regulations by adding what can be strict new performance standards to certain resource areas which had previously been subject to less strict standards. The Department disagrees. Adding a new interest to be protected under M.G.L. c. 131, § 40 clearly requires new performance standards in some resource areas, but in no case has the Department changed the definition or boundaries of any resource area as previously defined, nor has it changed any rules pertaining to the buffer zone or uplands. Furthermore, although there were a very large number of comments asking the Department to protect small, upland vernal pools, the Department has consistently rejected this suggestion on the basis that such an action would expand the geographic jurisdiction of conservation commissions and the Department, in contradiction to the intention of most parties supporting the wetlands/wildlife amendment and the Legislature itself.

C. Vernal Pools. On the issue of vernal pools, the Department received two groups of comments. As noted directly above, many individuals and organizations pressed the Department to protect all vernal pools, including those outside currently defined wetland resource areas, but this was rejected as an unauthorized expansion of jurisdiction. Many parties, including the Department's own regional staff, noted that because they are often very small in size and usually temporary in nature, the proposed regulatory language on identifying vernal pools would lead to innumerable, frequently insoluble disputes over the presence of such habitats on Land Subject to Flooding. After extensive research on vernal pool identification techniques, the Department concluded that it would be unfair to applicants to retain proposed requirements that could force them to conduct difficult, timely, expensive and often inconclusive searches for possible vernal pools. Instead, the final regulations create a presumption that vernal pools are present only when mapped, where such maps have been certified by the Division of Fisheries and Wildlife. That Division has agreed to establish such a certification program, which will require evidence of the breeding of amphibian species that need vernal pools. Finally, scientific evidence was presented to the Department that areas immediately surrounding vernal pools generally serve all the important nonbreeding habitat functions of amphibians which require vernal pools for breeding. Consequently, the regulations contain performance standards protecting the area within 100 feet of the boundaries of vernal pools.

D. Floodplains. Perhaps the most controversial provisions in the proposed regulations were those protecting floodplains (Bordering Land Subject to Flooding). On the one hand, there were many comments urging the Department to protect all wildlife habitats (including fields) throughout the 100 year floodplain, except for those portions altered by human activity. On the other hand, others suggested that the Department has no basis for proposing to presume that woodlands (or other defined areas) on the entire 100-year floodplain were significant to the protection of "important" wildlife habitat functions. The Department recognized some merit in each of these contentions, and incorporated aspects of both in the final regulations.

As noted above, presumptions of significance are based on scientifically grounded generalizations on how resource areas typically function; however, regarding protection of wildlife habitat, they are also limited to those wetland habitats which, due to certain physical characteristics, provide "important" functions for wildlife (*i.e.*, those "special" qualities which, though they may be present in uplands, are particularly prevalent or valuable in wetland resource



10.00: continued

areas). The Preamble describing important wildlife habitat functions of floodplains in 310 CMR 10.57(1)(a)(3) indicates that these functions stem from five major factors: frequent flooding, close proximity to water bodies, moistness of soils, the vegetative corridor which aids movement of wildlife to and from as well as along water bodies, and the "edge" effect which causes wildlife to thrive in the area where two different habitat types meet (e.g., where water bodies or bordering vegetated wetlands meet other habitat). Such habitat clearly is not limited to woodlands, but rather extends to fields and other areas which have not been so altered by human activities as to effectively eliminate their special wetland habitat value. The final regulations reflect this principle. It is also true that the five key factors which provide "important" wetland wildlife habitat functions are generally much more prevalent on the lower floodplain (that closest to the water body) than the upper floodplain. Indeed, as one moves away from the water body and bordering vegetated wetland into the infrequently flooded areas of the 100-year floodplain, the habitat becomes increasingly indistinguishable in its vegetative and hydrologic characteristics from upland areas.

Therefore, in the final regulations the Department determined that a presumption of significance for wildlife habitat was warranted only for the lower floodplain (except for vernal pools, which are clearly essential for certain amphibians wherever they appear on the floodplain). The lower floodplain is defined as areas on the 10 year floodplain or within 100 feet of the bank or bordering vegetated wetland, whichever is further from the water body or waterway. "Important" floodplain habitat on the upper floodplain may also be protected on a case by case basis where evidence of its existence has been demonstrated, though this area is not presumed to be significant to the protection of wildlife habitat.

E. Thresholds. The Department proposed the creation of project size thresholds for three resource areas (inland Banks, Land Under Water, and Land Subject to Flooding) below which alterations are not deemed to have an adverse effect on the protection of important wildlife habitat functions. Though there were objections to this concept, the Department found, as explained in detail above, that use of thresholds is the most scientifically valid and least complex method of protecting "important" wildlife habitat in these resource areas, while allowing small, unimportant alterations (*i.e.*, unimportant from a regional or statewide prospective). Many commentators expressed concern that although the proposed threshold alterations may appear small individually, repeated undertakings of threshold projects on the same property could cause large cumulative impacts on wildlife habitat. In response to these comments, the Department has added a provision insuring that such small alterations will not be allowed, cumulatively, to have a major impact on important wildlife habitat functions. The thresholds may only be applied once per lot after the effective date of the wildlife regulations. This rule regarding cumulative impacts applies only to the protection of wildlife habitat on inland Banks, Land Under Water and Land Subject to Flooding. The Department takes no position at this time as to whether this is the appropriate method of addressing cumulative impact issues regarding limited projects or performance standards in effect prior to the promulgation of the new regulations protecting wildlife habitat. There were also numerous comments that the proposed thresholds were too small to allow for certain projects which must necessarily be located on or near water -- for example bridges, marinas, wastewater treatment plants, etc. Rather than raising the thresholds for all projects, however, the final regulations take cognizance of these water-dependent uses by creating a new "limited" project category for such uses (except those in bordering vegetated wetlands) with their own performance standards. To balance the net effect on important wildlife habitat functions, we have tightened the thresholds for non-water-dependent uses on inland resource areas (except bordering vegetated wetlands) to no more than 10% of those portions of an owner's lot found to be significant to the protection of wildlife habitat (the maximum limits of 50 linear feet of Bank and 5,000 sq. ft. of Land Under Water or Land Subject to Flooding, contained in the proposed regulations, were retained in the final regulations).

10.00: continued

F. Rare Species. Most commentators strongly supported protection for rare species, but a number of technical changes were suggested and incorporated into the final regulations. Applicants with proposed projects on "Estimated Habitat Maps" may, if they wish, contact the Natural Heritage and Endangered Species program 90 days before filing their Notice of Intent and receive a response within 45 days, so as to facilitate project designs which will meet rare species performance standards. In all cases, the Heritage Program will have at least 30 days to respond to notification that a proposed project is on the Estimated Habitat map, and no Order of Conditions may be issued before that time.

G. Wildlife Habitat Evaluations. A number of commentators found Section 10.60 (which sets standards for determining whether "above threshold" projects on inland Banks, Land Under Water, or Bordering Land Subject to Flooding will adversely effect wildlife habitat) to be confusing. The final regulations, we believe, are clearer. The basic standard for determining adverse effects is whether the project would substantially reduce specified important wildlife habitat functions. Standards for restoration and replication of wildlife habitat were also clarified. Although there were some comments in opposition to allowing off-site replication, we believe that the performance standards for replication are sufficiently stringent to protect wildlife habitat, especially since off-site replication above 5,000 sq. ft. of bordering vegetated wetlands (the most valuable wildlife habitat) remains prohibited under the stringent performance standards contained in the present regulations. Furthermore, an Order of Conditions may require that replicated habitat in fact meets the standard of no substantial reduction in habitat value for an indefinite period in the future, so that further efforts can be required if initial replication is unsuccessful.

PREFACE TO WETLANDS REGULATIONS RELATIVE  
TO RIGHTS OF WAY MANAGEMENT

1987 REGULATORY REVISION

In 1983, the Massachusetts Pesticide Control Act, M.G.L. c. 132B, was amended to require notification of conservation commissions prior to application of herbicides on rights of way. Many commissions became aware for the first time that application of herbicides on rights of way may result in alteration of wetlands and, with the exception of exempt utilities, may require action under the M.G.L. c. 131, § 40. On July 18, 1986, the Department issued a final decision after adjudicatory hearing in DEP Hearing Docket Nos. 83-28 and 83-35 (Clinton and Leverett) finding that the application of specific herbicides by the railroads to track and ballast within 100 feet of wetland areas would alter those wetlands and was therefore subject to jurisdiction under M.G.L. c. 131, § 40, requiring the filing of Notices of Intent with the local conservation commissions.

The Department of Food and Agriculture (DFA) initiated a Generic Environmental Impact Report (GEIR) evaluating alternatives for rights of way management. A technical advisory task force of environmentalists, agencies and rights of way managers assisted in the GEIR preparation and, based on results of the study, recommended to the Secretary of Environmental Affairs a framework for a coherent state-wide rights of way regulatory program. DFA published draft regulations to implement this program in 1986 and received extensive public commentary. Final regulations, 333 CMR 11.00, became effective on July 10, 1987.

The DFA regulations require persons proposing to apply herbicides to rights of way to first receive approval of a five year Vegetation Management Plan (VMP) and Yearly Operating Plan (YOP). These regulations identify certain "sensitive areas", including wetlands and public and private surface and groundwater supplies, where the application of herbicides is, in most instances, prohibited, and areas adjacent to the sensitive areas where use of herbicides is curtailed.

DEP worked closely with DFA to include provisions which give maximum protection for water supplies and provide protection for wetlands at least equal to that provided under the M.G.L. c. 131, § 40 and 310 CMR 10.00. To eliminate duplicate review under M.G.L. c. 131, § 40, DEP has adopted changes to the wetlands regulations which allow herbicide applications on rights of way in accordance with the DFA regulations without filing a Notice of Intent under the M.G.L. c. 131, § 40. However, non-exempt applicants will still be required to file a Request for Determination of Applicability to the appropriate conservation commission to establish boundaries of wetlands on or near the right of way. Specifically, these regulations presume that work performed in accordance with a VMP and YOP, as may be required under DFA regulations, will not alter an area subject to protection under M.G.L. c. 131, § 40.

During the public comment period on its proposed regulations, the Department identified several issues of major concern. After consideration of all comments, the Department has determined that, except for minor points of clarification and the addition of an automatic expiration date, no further changes in the regulations are warranted at this time. A discussion of these issues follows.

A. Presumption vs. Limited Project. Several commentators suggested that conservation commissions should retain the authority to review each herbicide application on rights of way through the usual Notice of Intent process. These regulations create a presumption that herbicide application carried out in accordance with an approved VMP and YOP under the DFA regulations will not alter wetlands and that the filing of a Notice of Intent is therefore not required. This procedure was established pursuant to the recommendation of the GEIR task force which states:

10.00: continued

The regulations which provide for approval of Vegetation Management Plans by the Department of Food and Agriculture should be conditioned on review and approval by the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) of those portions of the Plans that deal with wetlands. The DEP should be required to certify to the DFA that these portions of the Plans will result in compliance with the substantive and procedural provisions which protect the interests of the M.G.L. c. 131, § 40. If the regulations are so drawn, activities under a Plan approved by DEP would not constitute an alteration of wetlands as defined under 310 CMR 10.00.

Since the DFA regulations provide that DEP is a member of the VMP advisory panel which reviews and makes recommendations on the approval of VMPs, the GEIR task force recommendations have been fully implemented. Therefore, the Department has determined that it would be duplicative to require the filing of individual Notices of Intent in each municipality for each application of herbicides to rights of way.

B. Adequacy of Setback from Wetlands. The DFA rights of way regulations prohibit application of herbicides on or within ten feet of wetlands and strictly limit herbicide application from ten feet to 100 feet of wetlands. Many commentators questioned the adequacy of these setback requirements and suggested that a 50 or 100 foot no spray zone would be more appropriate. Several commentators suggested that the proposed setback requirements were inconsistent with the Department's adjudicatory hearing decision in the Clinton and Leverett cases.

The no spray zone surrounding wetlands is necessary for three reasons: to compensate for mapping errors, to compensate for applicator errors and to assure that herbicides will not migrate into wetlands after application on the adjacent uplands. During the public comment period, the Department received no evidence demonstrating that the ten-foot setback established in the DFA regulations will not be adequate. The DFA regulations establish a procedure for selecting a limited number of herbicides that may be applied in the limited spray zone (from 10 to 100 feet from wetlands) which is adjacent to the no spray zone. Herbicides that will be selected for use in these limited spray zones under the DFA regulations are those which available data demonstrate will not migrate further than ten feet.

The applicators have argued that they can maintain a level of accuracy in mapping of wetlands and in application of herbicides to assure that herbicides will not be inadvertently applied within ten feet of wetland areas. The Department is not convinced that these claims are unreasonable; however, in order to confirm their accuracy, the Department has included in the final regulations an automatic expiration date two years from the effective date, which is coterminous with the expiration date of the DFA regulations. During the two-year effective period of these regulations, the Department expects applicators to conduct studies monitoring herbicide application operations and to submit a report concerning impacts of herbicide application on wetlands under these new regulations detailing the accuracy of wetlands mapping, the accuracy of herbicide application, and the extent of herbicide migration. The results of this study will provide a basis for recommendations by the Department for amendments to the DFA regulations and a decision on reauthorization of these amendments to the Department's wetland regulations.

Finally, the Department does not find the setbacks requirements established in the  
DFA  
regulations  
to be  
inc

on  
sis  
ten  
t  
wit  
h  
its  
de  
cis  
ion  
in  
the  
Cli  
nto  
n  
an  
d  
Le  
ver  
ett  
ca  
se  
s.  
In  
tha  
t  
de  
cis  
ion  
,  
the  
De  
pa  
rt  
m  
ent  
as  
su  
m  
ed  
a  
wo  
rst  
-ca  
se  
an  
aly  
sis  
in  
ter  
ms  
of  
an  
he  
rbi  
cid  
e  
kn  
ow  
n  
to  
be

highly mobile vehicle which was applied to the track and ballast areas adjacent to wetlands. The Department found, based on the particular facts of the cases and the pa

rtic  
ula  
r  
he  
rbi  
cid  
e  
  
pr  
op  
os  
ed  
for  
ap  
pli  
cat  
ion  
tha  
t  
the  
re  
wo  
uld  
be  
a  
mi  
gr  
ati  
on  
of  
tha  
t  
he  
rbi  
cid  
e  
int  
o  
the  
we  
tla  
nd  
s  
fro  
m  
ap  
pli  
cat  
ion  
wit  
hin  
the  
10  
0-f  
oot  
buf  
fer  
zo  
ne  
tha  
t  
wo

uld  
be  
suf  
fici  
ent  
ly  
co  
nc  
ent  
rat  
ed  
to  
ca  
us  
e  
alt  
er  
ati  
on  
s  
of  
the  
we  
tla  
nd  
s  
pla  
nts  
. Ho  
we  
ver  
, the  
DF  
A  
rig  
hts  
of  
wa  
y  
m  
an  
ag  
e  
m  
ent  
re  
gul  
ati  
on  
s  
set  
up  
a  
pr  
oc  
ed  
ur  
e  
for  
ide



ntif  
ica  
tio  
n  
of  
he  
rbi  
cid  
es  
wh  
ich  
ar  
e  
rel  
ati  
vel  
y  
im  
m  
obi  
le  
an  
d  
wh  
ich  
ar  
e  
pr  
ea  
pp  
rov  
ed  
for  
ap  
pli  
cat  
ior  
on  
the  
buf  
fer  
zo  
ne  
in  
or  
de  
r  
to  
av  
oid  
alt  
er  
ati  
on  
of  
we  
tla  
nd  
s  
pla  
nts  
.

Fu  
rth  
er  
m  
or  
e,  
gui  
del  
ine  
s  
for  
ap  
pli  
cat  
ion  
of  
the  
sel  
ect  
ed  
he  
rbi  
cid  
es  
will  
als  
o  
be  
est  
abl  
ish  
ed.

Fin  
all  
y,  
no  
he  
rbi  
cid  
es  
m  
ay  
be  
ap  
pli  
ed  
wit  
hin  
ten  
fee  
t of

10.00: continued

wetland areas. In light of the strict controls placed on application of herbicides within the 100-foot buffer zone under the DFA regulations, the Department finds that adoptions of the proposed regulatory scheme is fully consistent with its previous adjudicatory hearing decision in the Clinton and Leverett cases.

C. Impacts of Herbicides Application on Wildlife Habitat. The Department is currently developing regulations under M.G.L. c. 131, § 40 to protect wildlife habitat. The effective date of these regulations is November 1, 1987. One commentator expressed concern regarding the impact of herbicide application on wildlife habitat in wetlands, and particularly on the habitat of rare, "state-listed" wildlife species. As discussed above, the Department has determined that the DFA regulations provide for protection of wetlands from alterations due to herbicide application. However, the OFA regulations do not include floodplains in their definition of wetlands, although those regulations do prohibit herbicide application within 10 feet of any standing or flowing surface water. Beyond that, there is no specific protection of wildlife habitat, including rare species, in floodplain areas.

The Department is concerned that the DFA regulations do not specifically address protection of wildlife habitat in floodplains, in particular those rare, "state-listed" wildlife species. Therefore, as a member of the VMP advisory panel, the Department will review VMPs for potential effect on wildlife habitat and specifically will recommend disapproval of any VMP that will have an adverse effect in areas mapped by the Natural Heritage and Endangered Species Program as habitat of any rare, "state-listed" wildlife species. Furthermore, the Department expects applicators to incorporate into the previously discussed two-year monitoring study a section detailing the effects of herbicide application on wildlife habitat in floodplains and on the habitat of rare, "state-listed" wildlife species. The Department will use the results of this study as the basis for recommending any amendments to the DFA regulations and a decision on reauthorization of these amendments to the Department's wetlands regulations.

PREFACE TO THE WETLANDS REGULATIONS

1983 REGULATORY REVISIONS

I. INTRODUCTION

Under the provisions of the Wetlands Protection Act, M.G.L. c. 131, § 40 ("M.G.L. c. 131, § 40"), no person may remove, fill, dredge or alter certain resource areas without first filing a Notice of Intent and obtaining an Order of Conditions. The Act requires that any order so issued must contain conditions sufficient to preserve and promote the following public interests: the protection of public or private water supply and groundwater supply, the enhancement of flood control and storm damage prevention, the prevention of pollution and the protection of fisheries and land containing shellfish.

Pursuant to the rulemaking authority set forth in M.G.L. c. 131, § 40, the Department of Environmental Protection first adopted wetlands regulations in 1974, amending them in 1977 and again in 1978. After extensive review, the Department is now issuing a comprehensive revision of its Wetlands Regulations, 310 CMR 10.00. Not only has Part I, Regulations for all Wetlands, been completely rewritten, but a new Part III has been added: Additional Regulations for Inland Wetlands, 310 CMR 10.51 et seq. Other than minor changes in format, however, no revisions have been made to Part II, Additional Regulations for Coastal Wetlands, 310 CMR 10.21 et seq. In the Department's judgment, the Part II regulations have worked well, so much so that their salient elements - e.g., the use of presumptions of significance and performance standards - have been incorporated in Part III.

II. THE RULEMAKING PROCESS

During the entire period that its regulations were in preparation, the Department had the benefit of advice and consultation from knowledgeable groups and individuals, most particularly representatives from the development and environmental communities, civil engineers and wetlands scientists. Where consensus was attained and deemed consistent with the Department's responsibilities under M.G.L. c. 131, § 40, the regulations reflect it; in other instances, the Department weighed conflicting points of view and chose a course of action that in its judgment best served both the interests identified in M.G.L. c. 131, § 40 and private property rights.

To briefly summarize the lengthy process by which these regulations were prepared; during a large part of 1979 a special task force comprised of representatives of the environmental groups, the developers, general contractors, utilities, the Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce, land use consultants, the Executive Office of Communities and Development, the Attorney General's Office and the Department met on a regular basis and ultimately produced a working set of draft regulations, much of which is incorporated in the regulations now being promulgated. Certain issues remained unresolved, however, and in the Fall of 1980 a smaller group was formed to assist the Department in preparing its public hearing draft. This group -- which consisted of a wetlands scientist from the University of Massachusetts, a civil engineer with extensive wetlands experience, an environmental attorney, the general counsel for the Home Builder's Association of Massachusetts, a senior

10.00: continued

staff member from the Department's Division of Wetlands Protection and the Division's Director -- met on a number of occasions to discuss the remaining issues and to provide the Department with the points of view of the various constituencies represented.<sup>1</sup>

On May 25, 1981, the Department issued its proposed regulations for public comment. Public information meetings were held throughout the state during the first two weeks of June, and were closely followed by public hearings.<sup>2</sup> In addition to testimony taken during the hearings, the Department received and reviewed 142 letters containing approximately 900 separate comments on various aspects of the proposed regulations.

To assist the Department in weighing these comments, in resolving the remaining scientific and engineering issues and in preparing its final draft, a Wetlands Technical Review Group was established, consisting of representatives from the Division of Wetlands Protection, the Division of Fish and Wildlife, the Division of Water Pollution Control, the Department's Metro-Boston/Northeast Region, the Office of Coastal Zone Management, the University of Massachusetts and a number of engineering consulting firms. Another advisory group was created to assist the Department in making final revisions to the many forms required for administration of M.G.L. c. 131, § 40, forms that are now set forth at 310 CMR 10.99. Finally, in an effort to more accurately assess the impact of the new regulations on development in Massachusetts, the Division of Wetlands Protection and the MEPA unit of the Executive Office of Environmental Affairs jointly reviewed all Environmental Notification Forms filed between October 1, 1980 and September 21, 1981, establishing the precise extent to which the projects involved would experience greater or lesser regulatory control under the new regulations.

### III. THE GENERAL APPROACH

Above all, the regulations are intended to put an end to the confusing, inconsistent and sometimes unnecessary regulatory practices that have attended administration of M.G.L. c. 131, § 40 in the past, especially with respect to the issue of jurisdiction. At one extreme, it has been argued by those espousing a very restrictive interpretation of M.G.L. c. 131, § 40 that jurisdiction is limited to only those activities that are undertaken within the boundaries of the areas specified in M.G.L. c. 131, § 40. This is erroneous, in the Department's view, for a close reading of M.G.L. c. 131, § 40 indicates that regulation extends not only to such activities but to all work, regardless of where it is located, that has the demonstrable effect of removing, filling, dredging or altering an area subject to protection under M.G.L. c. 131, § 40.

<sup>1</sup> In addition, throughout the entire rulemaking process successive drafts of the regulations were distributed to a broad range of agencies, groups and individuals for their comment. Input was sought and received from the Executive Office of Communities and Development, the Department of Environmental Management, the Department of Public Works, the Department of Agriculture, the Massachusetts Coastal Zone Management Office, the MEPA unit of the Executive Office of Environmental Affairs, the Joint Committee on Natural Resources and Agriculture, the Governor's Development Office, the Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce, the Home Builders Association of Massachusetts, Associated General Contractors of Massachusetts, Construction Industries of Massachusetts, New England Power Company, Boston Edison Company, New England Legal Foundation, Massachusetts Association of Professional Foresters, Massachusetts Association of Conservation Commissions, Massachusetts Forests and Parks Association/Environmental Lobby of Massachusetts, Massachusetts Audubon Society, the Conservation Law Foundation of New England and a number of private engineering and land use consulting firms. The Department is grateful for the time and effort expended by these groups, and to a significant extent the proposed regulations reflect their insights, expertise and sound counsel.

<sup>2</sup> Public information meetings were held in Lakeville (June 2, 1981), Holyoke (June 3, 1981), Worcester (June 8, 1981) and Lexington (June 17, 1981). Public hearings were

held in Lakeville (June 17, 1981), Holyoke (June 18, 1981), Worcester (June 22, 1981) and Boston (June 23, 1981).

10.00: continued

At the other extreme, it has been the Department's experience that considerable upland acreage has been unnecessarily regulated by local conservation commissions on the basis of highly questionable assumptions with respect to the anticipated impact of a proposed project on a protected area located some distance away. Some projects have been subject to regulation in their entirety, even though only a portion of the proposed work is adjacent to a wetland or adjacent to land subject to flooding. Similarly, entire projects have on occasion been subject to unnecessary and costly delay because a portion of the site is adjacent to a wetland, even though no actual work is proposed within 100 feet of that area. Finally, in some instances projects have been regulated even though no part of the site is in or even adjacent to an area subject to protection under M.G.L. c. 131, § 40.

In short, under current regulatory practices a substantial amount of the upland acreage still available for development in the Commonwealth is subject to preconstruction review of doubtful legal and practical validity.<sup>3</sup> It is the Department's view that in the vast majority of cases it is unnecessary to regulate projects outside land subject to flooding and beyond 100 feet from freshwater wetlands bordering water bodies, provided that the wetlands themselves are left intact in order to attenuate project impacts.

It is also the Department's view that while engineering solutions can protect the statutory interests at stake in most projects located in or near banks, floodplains and land under waterways and water bodies, this is not the case with bordering freshwater wetlands. The complex natural functioning of these wetlands cannot be replicated, and no amount of engineering will enable such areas to be filled or substantially altered without seriously impairing the statutory interests they serve.<sup>4</sup> The regulations now promulgated reflect both this conclusion and the Department's concern with overregulation of uplands; while placing strict limits on those areas to be subject to preconstruction review, the regulations substantially increase the protection to be provided them.

Thus for the development community the most troublesome aspect of the regulations has been that in a majority of cases major alterations of freshwater wetlands bordering on water bodies would be greatly restricted or prohibited. According to the U.S. Soil Conservation Service estimates, however, these areas represent only 4.36 percent of the total land and water area of the state, or approximately 352,975 acres. A large portion of this area is already unbuildable because it is in public or quasi-public ownership for open space purposes,<sup>5</sup> because natural limitations such as the depth of organic soils make building impractical<sup>6</sup> or

<sup>3</sup> The Department estimates that as much as 10,000 acres of upland may be unnecessarily regulated each year.

<sup>4</sup> In issuing its proposed regulations for public comment, the Department specifically requested interested parties to comment on this position and on a suggested alternative that would leave the issuing authority with discretion to set conditions for work in bordering vegetated wetlands. Nothing was submitted in response or emerged in the course of further review of the question to alter the Department's original conclusion that there is no technical basis for conditioning work in bordering vegetated wetlands. See Section V.C., however, for a discussion of certain limited alterations of these wetlands that the Department has concluded can be carried out without impairment of their function.

<sup>5</sup> The United States Soil Conservation Service estimates that approximately 60,000 acres of the freshwater wetlands in Massachusetts are in public or quasi-public ownership.

<sup>6</sup> According to soil studies done by the U.S. Soil Conservation Service, three percent of the total land and water area of Massachusetts is freshwater wetlands underlain by highly compressible organic materials (peat, muck, and shallow and deep marsh). Thus approximately 242,882 acres or 68.81 percent of the Commonwealth's bordering freshwater

wetlands is already greatly limited if not unavailable for development.



10.00: continued

because existing local and federal laws already restrict building in these areas.<sup>7</sup> On the other hand, as previously indicated the development community gains a significant decrease in regulation of adjacent uplands, along with a substantial increase in the clarity, certainty and consistency of decision-making.

For the environmental community, the most troublesome aspect of the regulations has been the fact that there would be a significant loss of control over work proposed in adjacent uplands. What the environmental community and the general public gain, on the other hand, is that under the revised regulations freshwater wetlands which border water bodies remain substantially intact. Jurisdiction continues to be asserted over work proposed within 100 feet of bordering wetlands when it appears that such work will alter the wetland. Beyond that distance, however, and beyond the boundary of land subject to flooding, preconstruction review is not required because the Department has determined it to be unlikely that the work will cause impacts that cannot be sufficiently attenuated by the wetland system itself.

#### IV. SUMMARY OF THE REGULATIONS

The promulgated regulations, in many of their particulars, represent a departure from existing standards and procedures. In other respects, these regulations codify for the first time administrative practices that over the years have evolved in the course of the regulatory work performed by the Department's wetlands staff and local conservation commissions. As noted above, these regulations are intended above all to promote clarity, certainty and consistency in decision-making, both on the local level and on appeal to the Department. Accordingly, the regulations address with great specificity the three major issues that in the Department's experience are at the heart of much of the past regulatory confusion: the question of jurisdiction, the question of a resource area's significance and the question of the extent to which work is to be conditioned (*i.e.*, the performance standards to be applied).

##### A. Jurisdiction

In the past, a major item of concern for developers, home builders and private property owners has been the fact that the wetlands regulations did not provide clear and workable guidance as to just what areas were subject to regulation. As a result, jurisdiction has been asserted inconsistently by local conservation commissions, and on occasion in excess of their statutory mandate; indeed, the Governor's Commission to Simplify Rules and Regulations has identified this issue as a major target for regulatory reform.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>7</sup> Examples include local zoning and non-zoning wetlands by-laws, local flood plain zoning, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers "404" permit program and the Federal Emergency Management Agency's ("FEMA") flood insurance program. FEMA estimates that over 40,000 acres in Massachusetts are in the floodway, much of which is wetland. No development is permitted in the floodway that will increase flood levels during the 100-year flood, a requirement that in most cases amounts to a prohibition on building.

<sup>8</sup> See Report of the Governor's Commission to Simplify Rules and Regulations Recommendation No. 11: "Quantitative thresholds for delimiting significant wetlands subject to the law must be incorporated into the regulations." The Commission goes on to recommend (1) that regulated wetlands should contain at least 50 percent or more of indigenous wetlands plants, a limitation that the Department concurs in and has incorporated in its regulations at 310 CMR 10.55(2)(c), and (2) that minimum or lower level thresholds be established for the water bodies specified in M.G.L. c. 131, § 40, thresholds that now can be found in the revised regulations in both the definitions section, 310 CMR 10.04, and in Part III.

10.00: continued

Accordingly, the new promulgated regulations clarify jurisdiction by providing explicit definitions and boundaries for each of the resource areas identified in M.G.L. c. 131, § 40; as M.G.L. c. 131, § 40 requires, work within these areas cannot go forward without the filing of a Notice of Intent and the issuance of an Order of Conditions. In addition, because it is the Department's judgment that work undertaken within 100 feet of bordering vegetated wetlands has a very high likelihood of adversely affecting those ecologically sensitive areas, the regulations require that anyone contemplating such work must file a Request for a Determination of Applicability with the conservation commission in order to insure that prior to commencement of the work an informed and public decision will be made as to possible impacts.<sup>9</sup> Finally, the regulations make clear that work outside the resource areas and outside the 100-foot buffer zone surrounding bordering vegetated wetlands can proceed without preconstruction review; jurisdiction over such work can be asserted only upon a showing that it has actually altered a resource area.

#### B. Significance

Clearly defining the resource areas and their boundaries, of course, is but the first step; regulation of work within such areas can be justified only if the area contributes in some significant way to the interests identified in M.G.L. c. 131, § 40. In order to guide conservation commissions in making this determination, the Department has studied each of the resource areas generically, and has developed presumptions of significance for each.<sup>10</sup> These presumptions can be overcome by a showing that the resource area in question functions atypically; their role in the regulatory process is only to provide a formal statement of value and to serve as a device by which decision-making, especially on the local level, can be influenced so as to insure that each resource area is accorded its proper ecological value, no more or no less. The use and derivation of these presumptions of significance are discussed further in Section V of this Preface.

#### C. Performance Standards

Finally, general performance standards have been developed for each of the resource areas, standards that are to be utilized by the conservation commissions and Department staff in drafting orders of conditions once an area has been determined significant to one or more of the interests set forth in M.G.L. c. 131, § 40. In general, the standards are intended (1) to maintain the channel carrying capacity of banks and land under waterways and water bodies, (2) to preserve the flood storage capacity of floodplains and (3) to prevent major alterations of core bordering vegetated wetlands (*i.e.*, the portion of those wetlands bordering waterways and water bodies within which wetlands vegetation clearly predominates).

<sup>9</sup> The buffer zone concept has been used by conservation commissions and the Department's wetlands staff for years; its inclusion in the regulations is therefore no more than a codification of past practices. As the regulations make clear, however, jurisdiction does not automatically extend outward 100 feet from the edge of a bordering vegetated wetland; although some conservation commissions have taken this position in the past, there is nothing in M.G.L. c. 131, § 40 to support it. Ultimately, the buffer zone filing requirement is only a device by which local conservation commissions can be informed of work which in the Department's experience is sufficiently close to vegetated wetlands to pose significant potential for adverse impact. A notice of intent may be required for such work, but only after a determination has been made that the work will alter the neighboring wetland. For a further discussion of this issue, see Section V.A. of this Preface.

<sup>10</sup> Land subject to flooding, for example, has been found to be significant to flood control and storm damage prevention. See 310 CMR 10.57(1)(a) and 10.57(1)(b). Bordering vegetated wetlands, on the other hand, have been found significant to all of

the interest identified in M.G.L. c. 131, § 40. See 310 CMR 10.55(1).

10.00: continued

## V. ISSUES OF MAJOR CONCERN

In soliciting public comment on its proposed regulations, the Department identified a number of issues that were of particular concern and that had generated the most debate during its deliberations and preparation of earlier drafts. After consideration of all comments and extended consultation with the Technical Review Group, final regulations have now been prepared and promulgated. For some of these major issues, significant changes have been made; for others, the Department found no reason to alter its original position. A discussion of each of these issues follows.

### A. Regulation of Work Within the 100-Foot Buffer Zone

It has been the Department's experience that any project undertaken in close proximity to a wetlands resource area has a high likelihood of resulting in some alteration of that area, either immediately, as a consequence of daily operation of the completed project. The problem becomes particularly acute where bordering vegetated wetlands are involved; inadvertent damage to these sensitive areas can easily occur and in many instances is irreparable. Accordingly, the adopted regulations require that any person intending to perform work within 100 feet of a bordering vegetated wetland must submit a Request for a Determination of Applicability to the local conservation commission.<sup>11</sup> In this way the commission has an opportunity to review the proposed project and to determine whether any alteration of the neighboring wetland will occur. If such a determination is made, then the project will require the filing of a Notice of Intent, just as if it were proposed for inside the wetland itself.

Of course, anyone contemplating a project within 100 feet of a bordering vegetated wetland can forego this preliminary determination by simply filing a Notice of Intent, an option that may be appropriate in those cases where it is obvious that the proposed work will indeed have an impact on the wetland. Equally, where the applicant proposes to take appropriate engineering measures to prevent impact on a neighboring wetland (and fully documents such measures in the Request for Determination of Applicability) there is no legitimate basis for requiring a Notice of Intent.

The proposed regulations called for the filing of a Notice of Intent whenever a conservation commission determined that work within a buffer zone would be "likely to alter" a neighboring wetland. Considerable opposition was encountered to this standard, primarily from those who feared that such language would encourage conservation commissions to assert jurisdiction over work in the buffer zone even in cases where the likelihood of impact was so remote as to be negligible. The Department stands by its experience that work performed in close proximity to wetlands often has an impact on them, but in order to insure that jurisdiction is asserted only in those cases where the likelihood of impact has been clearly and unquestionably established, the language of 310 CMR 10.02(2)(b) has been tightened from "likely to alter" to "will alter." In making this change, the Department seeks only to emphasize that jurisdiction is not to be automatically asserted over work in the buffer zone; it is still the intent of the regulations that whenever it is demonstrated that work in a buffer zone will have an impact on a neighboring wetland a Notice of Intent will be required and an appropriate Order of Conditions obtained.

<sup>11</sup> Under M.G.L. c. 131, § 40, any person may request the conservation commission to determine whether its provisions are "applicable to any land or work thereon." The procedures for obtaining such a determination are set forth in 310 CMR 10.05(3).

10.00: continued

Some commentators have also questioned the Department's authority to establish a buffer zone, citing the recent Appeals Court case of *Town of Rutland v. Fife*, Mass. App. Adv. Sh. (1981) 308.<sup>12</sup> Such objections, however, misconstrue the intended nature and function of the buffer zone; as noted above, its purpose is not to expand jurisdiction automatically beyond the boundaries of bordering vegetated wetlands, but to provide a mechanism by which local conservation commissions can be notified of projects located outside these boundaries but sufficiently close thereto to pose a potential environmental threat. Only in the event that the conservation commission concludes that the proposed project will alter the wetland is a Notice of Intent required.

Indeed, the concept of a buffer zone is hardly novel; although its precise origins are obscure, it has been informally applied for years by conservation commissions and the Department's wetlands staff. If anything, the regulations will put an end to the misconception, apparently still held by some commissions, that jurisdiction under M.G.L. c. 131, § 40 extends 100 feet beyond wetlands boundaries, irrespective of whether work in that zone will have any impact on the wetland.

In order to lessen the burden on persons planning projects within the buffer zone, the information required of them has been kept to a minimum. See Form 1, Request for a Determination of Applicability, 310 CMR 10.99. At the applicant's option, of course, supplementary information can be submitted to describe the manner in which proposed preventive measures will operate to insulate the wetland from damage and to demonstrate why no alteration of the wetland is likely.

#### B. Regulation of Work at Distances Greater Than 100 Feet From Bordering Vegetated Wetlands

A number of commentators questioned the Department's decision to limit the buffer zone to 100 feet and to require no preconstruction review for projects beyond that zone. They point to instances in which construction activity taking place well beyond the boundaries of a wetland has had an adverse impact on it, and emphasize the irreparable damage that such work can cause. Whatever protective zone is established will by its very nature be somewhat arbitrary, however, and in the Department's judgment and experience the likelihood of impact becomes so attenuated at distances greater than 100 feet that preconstruction review can no

<sup>12</sup> The Department questions whether the original opinion in *Rutland v. Fife* was in any way relevant to the validity of the 100-foot buffer zone contained in its regulations. In any event, the issue is now moot; on motion of the Attorney General's Office, the Appeals Court modified its opinion by adding the following footnote:

We do not decide the question whether work must be done in a wetland in order to constitute alteration of that wetland. Footnote, corrected page 309.

Under M.G.L. c. 131, § 40, the filing of a Notice of Intent is required whenever proposed work will "remove, fill, dredge or alter" a resource area. There is nothing in the text of M.G.L. c. 131, § 40 to indicate that such work can be regulated only when it takes place within the borders of a resource area, nor in the Department's judgment would such a limitation be appropriate; as noted above, the effects of construction well beyond the border of a wetland will often cause significant and irreparable damage to that area.

10.00: continued

longer be justified.<sup>13</sup> Accordingly, projects undertaken beyond the buffer zone are subject to regulation only when alteration of the wetland actually occurs, 310 CMR 10.02(2)(c). Furthermore, it is the Department's expectation that the regulatory scheme it has adopted will provide a clear incentive for developers to stay far removed from wetlands, since projects undertaken beyond the buffer zone will thereby avoid preconstruction review.

C. Performance Standards: Bordering Vegetated Wetlands

As noted above, performance standards similar to those developed by the Department for coastal wetlands have been incorporated in Part III of the regulations for each of the inland resource areas identified in M.G.L. c. 131, § 40. When an Order of Conditions is drafted by either a local conservation commission or the Department these standards will provide the general guidelines by which the proposed work is to be conditioned. In the case of bordering vegetated wetlands, as defined in 310 CMR 10.55, the Department has concluded that once such an area is determined to be significant to one or more of the interests specified in M.G.L. c. 131, § 40 any alteration or destruction of that area will impair if not eliminate its capacity to contribute to the protection of those interests. Accordingly, the performance standards for bordering vegetated wetlands allow work in those areas only under very narrowly defined circumstances.

Several commentators have questioned whether the Department has the authority, through its regulations, to limit construction activities in this manner; to the extent that prohibition is allowed at all, they argue, it is only pursuant to the Wetlands Restriction Act, M.G.L. c. 131, § 40A.<sup>14</sup> There are a number of responses to this argument, and because the performance standards for bordering vegetated wetlands are at the very heart of the Department's regulations, they will be discussed in some detail.

First, it should be noted that to the extent that the regulations can be characterized as prohibiting construction, it is only with respect to the most ecologically sensitive of the many resource areas identified in M.G.L. c. 131, § 40. In all other areas, the regulations now make clear, work can go forward under performance standards that are explicit in the protective measures that must be taken but are by no means prohibitive in their impact on development. It is only in bordering vegetated wetlands, the Department has concluded, that the interests of M.G.L. c. 131, § 40 cannot be protected other than by leaving the existing wetland plant community intact. While retention and detention basins and compensatory storage measures can replicate the flood control value of bordering vegetated wetlands, there are no engineering solutions currently

<sup>13</sup> At one point in its deliberations, the Department considered the possibility of employing a matrix approach to work done outside of but in close proximity to a wetlands boundary, utilizing certain factors to arrive at a buffer distance that would vary with local topography and project size. This approach was ultimately discarded as far too complex and cumbersome for applicants to deal with and conservation commissions to administer.

<sup>14</sup> As with the buffer zone, the stringent performance standards for bordering vegetated wetlands can hardly be characterized as revolutionary. Under the present regulations pertaining to salt marshes, the coastal equivalent of bordering vegetated wetlands, no project may be allowed that will destroy any portion of a salt marsh, 310 CMR 10.32(3). Similarly, under the present 310 CMR 10.2(27) an Order of Conditions "shall regulate or prohibit the (proposed) activity". See also letter of April 26, 1976, from the Chief of the Attorney General's Environmental Protection Division to all Conservation Commissions, written in the aftermath of *MacGibbon v. Board of Appeals of Duxbury*, 369 Mass. 512 (1976) and concluding that in our view, therefore, municipalities may continue to protect wetlands by the enactment of conservation bylaws under the Zoning Act and by the imposition of conditions or the prohibition of alteration of wetlands under

M.G.L. c. 131, § 40.

10.00: continued

available that can replace the capacity of such wetlands to renovate water quality or to provide food, cover and habitat for fisheries.<sup>15</sup>

In addition, the Department has defined the boundaries of bordering vegetated wetlands areas in a conservative manner, so that only the most essential inner reaches of these systems are subject to the strict performance standards; under 310 CMR 10.55(2)(c) "the boundary of bordering vegetated community consists of the wetlands plant species identified in M.G.L. c. 131, § 40." Compared to the expansive and often ad hoc boundary decisions occasioned by the previous regulations, the new regulations amount to a significant increase in the land area available for development.

Finally, after review of the comments and consultation with the Technical Review Group, the Department has identified two further means by which slight intrusions at the periphery of subject wetlands can be allowed without impairment of the functions they serve. Both such exceptions to the general prohibition on work in bordering vegetated wetlands have been carefully circumscribed, and are available only at the discretion of the issuing authority. The first, addressed at 310 CMR 10.55(4)(b), allows the loss of up to 5000 square feet of subject wetlands when the wetland habitat is replaced in accordance with the strict standards set forth in 310 CMR 10.55(4)(b)(1)-(7). The second provision permits the filling of linear wetland formations of less than 500 square feet, where such formations extend from the main body of subject wetlands into adjacent uplands. These formations characteristically occur along the edges of wetland systems in the glaciated northeast, and pursuant to 310 CMR 10.55(4)(c) they may be filled in those cases where the issuing authority decides that a project cannot otherwise go forward. In the Department's judgment, any such exception must be carefully conditioned by the issuing authority but is nevertheless appropriate because the narrow linear configuration of these formations means that (1) they represent a very small percentage of the surface area of subject wetlands within the state, (2) they can be distinguished clearly from the main body of subject wetlands, thus providing a definite limit to the amount of filling allowed and (3) they tend to divide otherwise buildable lots into parcels too small for practical use.

For the foregoing reasons, the Department concludes that its performance standards for bordering vegetated wetlands will not only preserve and protect the critical functions provided by this type of resource, but will not unduly impair development in the Commonwealth, a conclusion buttressed by the comprehensive review of past Environmental Notification Forms undertaken jointly by the Division of Wetlands Protection and the MEPA Unit of the Executive Office of Environmental Affairs.<sup>16</sup>

<sup>15</sup> Because of the extensive comments the Department received on its proposed performance standards for bordering vegetated wetlands, the issue was subjected to intense scrutiny by the Technical Review Group during the post-public hearing phase of this rulemaking. After extended deliberation, the Technical Review Group unanimously agreed that current research supports the position taken by the Department that the functions served by bordering vegetated wetlands cannot be replicated in their totality by engineering means.

<sup>16</sup> See letter of February 2, 1982 from Samuel Mygatt, Executive Director of the MEPA Unit to Anthony Cortese, Commissioner of the Department. In concluding his report, Mr. Mygatt makes the following observations:

First, the proposed regulations are extremely clear and easy to apply, and in almost all instances, their effect on a proposed project is readily predictable. This is in marked contrast to the present regulations. Secondly, the treatment of the "Buffer Zone" will be strong inducement to project proponents to carefully design their projects to minimize impacts on nearby wetland areas. Third, the proposed regulations will constrain suprisingly little present



development in Massachusetts.

10.00: continued

Of course, minimal impact on the ability to develop private property is no defense to the claim that the Department is acting *ultra vires*; if prohibition of certain activities is not necessary to effectuate the purposes of M.G.L. c. 131, § 40 or is not authorized thereunder, then it is irrelevant that the strict performance standards of 310 CMR 10.55 apply to a comparatively small portion of the total land area subject to regulation under M.G.L. c. 131, § 40. For the reasons detailed above, however, the Department has concluded that destruction of bordering vegetated wetlands must be curtailed if the interests identified in M.G.L. c. 131, § 40 are to be protected; it therefore only remains to be determined whether the language of M.G.L. c. 131, § 40 allows such protective measures.

Under M.G.L. c. 131, § 40, once a resource area is determined to be significant to one or more of the specified interests, the conservation commission (or the Department on appeal) is directed to issue an order imposing "such conditions as will contribute to the protection of the interests described herein, and all work shall be done in accordance therewith." There is certainly nothing in this language to indicate that in the appropriate case the interests may not be protected by prohibition, and as a general proposition of law it has been repeatedly recognized that the power to regulate implies the power to prohibit.<sup>17</sup>

The Department finds further and explicit support for its position in *Commissioner of Natural Resources v. S. Volpe and Co.*, 349 Mass. 104 (1965), which arose under M.G.L. c. 130, § 27A, a predecessor to the present Wetlands Protection Act. Under M.G.L. c. 130, § 27A, any person proposing to undertake work in a coastal wetland was required to file a notice of intent with the Director of Marine Fisheries; if the director determined that the wetland contained shellfish or was necessary to protect marine fisheries, he was authorized to "impose such conditions on said proposed work as he may determine necessary to protect such shellfish or marine fisheries, and work shall be done subject thereto," language that is virtually identical to that of the present Wetlands Protection Act. Pursuant to this authority, the director prohibited the filling of a large marsh in Wareham, an order that the Supreme Judicial Court concluded was lawful and consistent with the language of M.G.L. c. 130, § 27A. *Id.* at 111. Finally, in *Lovequist v. Conservation Commission of the Town of Dennis*, Mass. Adv. Sh. (1979) 2210, a local floodplain by-law empowered the town's conservation commission to deny permission for any project that would harm "the environmental quality of either or both the subject lands and contiguous lands." The by-law was attacked as being inconsistent with the Wetlands Protection Act, a challenge that was dismissed by the Supreme Judicial Court on a number of grounds, including the fact that "pursuant to (the Department's wetlands regulations) conservation commissions for almost five years have had a prerogative to prohibit construction which might injure wetlands areas." *Id.* at 2219.

Nor is there anything in the Wetlands Restriction Act, M.G.L. c. 131, § 40A, that would preclude exercising the power of prohibition under the Wetlands Protection Act. Under the Wetlands Restriction Act the Department of Environmental Management ("DEM") is authorized to adopt orders "regulating, restricting or prohibiting (the) dredging, filling, removing or otherwise altering or pollution (of) inland wetlands." The legislature thus provided DEM with the same broad range of regulatory options that are possible under the Wetlands Protection Act - regulation, restriction or prohibition - and if DEM has chosen to adopt a policy of prohibition this choice should certainly not operate to preclude the Department from acting similarly in the appropriate situation; if anything, DEM's program confirms the Department's judgment and experience with respect to the level of protection necessary to preserve the ecological functions of bordering vegetated wetlands. The Department notes that the DEM restriction program is a coordinated regional approach to entire watershed

<sup>17</sup> In *John Donnelly and Sons, Inc. v. Outdoor Advertising Board*, 369 Mass. 206, 214 (1975), for example, the Supreme Judicial Court upheld a local ordinance prohibiting all off-premise advertising, an ordinance that was passed pursuant to an Article of

Amendment to the Massachusetts Constitution that authorized the regulation and restriction of such advertising but was silent as to outright prohibition.

10.00: continued

systems, and views its own program as the local complement thereof. In addition, due to limitations on resources and finances, the DEM program has thus far been able to address the wetlands resources of only a small number of communities; pending completion of the DEM effort, it is all the more important to insure that the most critical of the Commonwealth's wetlands resources not be further destroyed.

D. Presumptions of Significance

As noted above, Part III of the newly promulgated regulations contains rebuttable presumptions of significance for each of the inland resource areas identified in M.G.L. c. 131, § 40. They are based on the Department's extensive experience in administering its wetlands protection program and on the recommendations of recognized science and engineering experts from both the consulting and academic communities. While it is the Department's judgment that the resource areas are so likely to be significant to the interests indicated in the revised regulations that the presumptions are justified, the prima facie force of each can be overcome by the introduction of sufficient evidence to the contrary.

E. Definition of "Stream"

During the public comment period the environmental community repeatedly expressed concern that under the proposed regulations intermittent streams throughout the Commonwealth would no longer be subject to jurisdiction. This has never been the Department's intention, and the definition has consequently been clarified to indicate that intermittent streams are included within the definition, except those portions that are upgradient of all wetlands. (See 310 CMR 10.04, definition of stream.) This provides a clear, practical cut-off point for distinguishing between true streams and small drainage channels which flow in direct response to precipitation.

F. Identification and Regulation of Land Subject to Flooding

The public hearing draft made a distinction between bordering land subject to flooding (*i.e.*, flood plains) and isolated land subject to flooding (*i.e.*, trapped drainage areas), set forth methods for determining the boundaries of each, and, with respect to bordering land subject to flooding, required compensatory storage for all storage volume that would be lost. The Technical Review Group unanimously endorsed this approach, but did make several recommendations for refinement which have been incorporated into the adopted regulations. These include (1) a provision allowing any party to challenge the accuracy of the boundary of the 100-year flood as derived from the National Flood Insurance Program profile data, and (2) clarification of the definition of compensatory storage. See 310 CMR 10.57.

G. Use of the Standard "in the judgment of the issuing authority"

Several commentators objected to the above language, which is used throughout the regulation in characterizing the various decisions that must be made by the issuing authority. Their argument is that such language appears to authorize a totally subjective judgment, but similar language in local ordinances has been upheld in court against just such a challenge. The use of this language is not intended to give conservation commissions or the Department any more discretionary authority than they now have under law and these regulations; indeed, each of the decisions they must make has been carefully circumscribed by the precise definitions and explicit performance standards set forth in the regulations. The Department's intention in utilizing this language is to make clear that where discretionary authority is warranted it is to be exercised by the issuing authority and not by project opponents or proponents.

10.00: continued

#### H. Enforcement Orders

310 CMR 10.08 sets forth the procedures with respect to enforcement orders, to which some parties have objected because there is no explicit authorization for the issuance of such orders in M.G.L. c. 131, § 40. Conservation commissions have been issuing cease and desist orders for years, typically when work is commenced in a wetland without first obtaining an Order of Conditions. This emergency authority is clearly necessary, for significant and irreversible damage can be done to such areas if a conservation commission's only recourse under such circumstances is to institute legal proceedings.<sup>18</sup>

According to M.G.L. c. 131, § 40, "rules and regulations shall be promulgated by the commissioner to effectuate the purposes of this section." Under M.G.L. c. 21A, § 2(28), the Department shall "promulgate rules and regulations necessary to carry out (its) statutory responsibilities." Given the fragile and irreplaceable nature of wetlands, the emergency power to stop a project that is in violation of M.G.L. c. 131, § 40 or these regulations is both necessary and consistent with statutory authority. To the extent that a landowner wishes to challenge the jurisdiction of the conservation commission or the grounds upon which an enforcement order was issued, he may go to Superior Court and seek immediate injunctive relief.

#### I. Work Pending Appeals

In order to lessen the nuisance potential of frivolous appeals, which often serve no purpose other than to frustrate meritorious projects, the regulations permit work to proceed, at the applicant's risk, 35 days after a negative determination of applicability by the conservation commission, even if an appeal has been taken to the Department. Similarly, work may proceed at the applicant's risk immediately following a negative determination by the Department, even if a request for an adjudicatory hearing has been filed. 310 CMR 10.05(3)(d). It should be noted that this ability to perform work in the face of an appeal is limited to situations involving determinations of applicability; under M.G.L. c. 131, § 40, as the Department interprets it, no work can proceed pursuant to an order to conditions once a request for a superseding order has been filed or, in the case of a superseding order, once a request for an adjudicatory hearing has been filed.

#### VI. STUDY GROUP

The Department has made a major effort to consider all of the impacts of these revised regulations on both wetlands and development in the Commonwealth. There is no way to know with certainty how any new regulations will work in all situations until there has been significant experience in their implementation. To insure that they work the way they are intended the Department plans to set up a study group composed of representatives from the environmental, development and consulting communities to monitor the effects of the regulations during the first year of their implementation. The study group will be charged with the responsibility of making recommendations to the Department should they determine after their one year review that further amendments are necessary.

<sup>18</sup> Indeed the Department and the Attorney General's Office jointly issued a report entitled "Recommended Procedures for Enforcement of the Wetlands Protection Act, Mass. M.G.L. c. 131, § 40, for Conservation Commissions," dated January 17, 1977, which included a sample cease and desist order similar to this enforcement order.

PREFACE TO WETLANDS REGULATIONS RELATIVE TO FEES

1989 REGULATORY REVISION

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Authority to Set Fees. Recognizing that conservation commissions and the Department of Environmental Protection need adequate resources to act expeditiously on filings under the Wetlands Protection Act, M.G.L. c. 131, § 40, ("M.G.L. c. 131, § 40") without compromising the quality of their decisions, the Legislature amended M.G.L. c. 131, § 40 during the Summer of 1988. St. 1988, c. 202, §§ 26 and 30 require the implementation of a sliding scale fee schedule for filing Notices of Intent, in order to defray state and local costs of administering the Wetlands Protection Act. The Act was further amended by St. 1989, c. 287, § 54 which requires that fifty percent of any Notice of Intent filing fee in excess of \$25 shall be made payable to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the remainder shall be made payable to the city or town in which the work is proposed.

In addition, the enabling legislation of the Executive Office of Administration and Finance, M.G.L. c. 7, § 3b as amended by St. 1988, c. 236, § 10, requires agencies which provide services of benefit to individuals to charge a fee commensurate with the cost of providing that service.

The wetlands fee system is codified at 310 CMR 10.00 WETLANDS PROTECTION (DEP) and 801 CMR 4.00 RATES (ADMINISTRATION & FINANCE). Department wetland regulations contain procedures and instructions regarding the fees established by Administration and Finance. Persons filing documents under the Wetlands Protection Act are advised to consult both regulations.

B. Purpose of Fee System. The purpose of the fee system is to defray local and state costs of administering the Wetlands Protection Act. The fee structure is intended to ensure that conservation commissions and the Department will have the resources to provide detailed project review and to issue regulatory decisions within required time frames.

C. Disposition of Notice of Intent Fees. For each Notice of Intent, the applicant must submit half of the fee in excess of \$25 to the DEP Lock Box and the balance to the city or town in which the work is proposed.

II. SUMMARY OF REGULATIONS

A. Notice of Intent Fees. An applicant must submit the correct fee amount in order to meet the minimum submittal requirements for a Notice of Intent. Fifty percent of the fee in excess of \$25 is paid to the DEP Lock Box. The remainder must be paid to the city or town where the work is proposed. If the conservation commission or the Department determines that an incorrect amount has been paid and has issued notification to the applicant, the filing is deemed incomplete and the time period for action is stayed. Once the correct fee amount has been paid and the filing is deemed complete, the time period for action will resume.

The list of project categories and associated fees can be found at 801 CMR 4.02(310). 310 CMR 10.03(7)(c) describes all the activities in each fee category. The filing fee is based on the project design as it is described in the initial Notice of Intent filing and applies only to activities proposed in areas subject to jurisdiction under M.G.L. c. 131, § 40. If the project is scaled down during the review process, the applicant does not receive a refund on any portion of the fee originally filed since the conservation commission and the Department have already spent the time reviewing the original proposal.

10.00: continued

B. Disputes Regarding Amount of Notice of Intent Fee. Should the conservation commission determine at any time during its deliberations that the incorrect fee amount has been paid by the applicant, the commission should notify the applicant and the Department. Further action on the filing is stayed until the correct fee has been paid. The applicant then may choose to pay the balance assessed by the commission without disputing it, pay the disputed amount (half to the Department and half to the city or town), or file a Request for Determination of Applicability. If the fee originally filed by the applicant is affirmed in a Final Order, the applicant is entitled to request a refund of the disputed amount, one half each from the Department and from the city or town.

If the applicant files a Request for Determination pursuant to a Notice of Insufficient Filing Fee, the Determination issued by the conservation commission, or by the Department on appeal, is determinative regarding the filing fee. During the processing of the Determination, action on the Notice of Intent is stayed.

C. Fees for Actions by the Department. Actions by the Department for which fees are assessed are specified in 801 CMR 4.02(310) and include Requests for Superseding Determinations of Applicability, Requests for Superseding Orders of Conditions, Claims for Adjudicatory Hearings, Requests to Intervene in an Adjudicatory Hearing, and Requests for Variances.

These fees shall be paid directly to the DEP Lock Box with a photocopy of the Request for Departmental Action Fee Transmittal Form accompanying the appeal. The Department will not proceed with review until receiving evidence that such fee has been paid.

D. Exemptions. 801 CMR 4.02(310) provides for certain exemptions to wetland filing fees.

PREFACE TO THE WETLANDS REGULATIONS RELATIVE TO TECHNICAL CHANGES  
1992 WETLANDS PROTECTION ACT REGULATORY REVISIONS (310 CMR 10.00)

NOTE: The following is a preface to, but does not form a part of, the Wetlands Protection Act Regulations (310 CMR 10.00).

Definition of Pond. The proposed redefinition of the term "pond" in 310 CMR 10.00 is being undertaken in order to clarify the intention of the Department to include those water bodies which were created by means other than by impoundment. A recent judicial decision, *Warcewicz v. DEP*, 410 Mass. 548, 574 N.E. 2d 364 (1991), rendered a strict interpretation of the current definition of pond which limited the jurisdiction of the Wetlands Protection Act with respect to man-made ponds to only those ponds created by damming or impoundment. The proposed regulatory amendment is intended to extend the protection afforded by the Wetlands Protection Act (the "Act") to those non-impounded man-made surface water bodies which serve to protect the interests of the Act and function as wetland resources. In the case of gravel pits and quarries, the jurisdiction of the proposed regulations is intended only to apply to those ponds in which mining operations have ceased for five or more consecutive years.

Rare Species. The regulatory revisions are primarily administrative in nature, with slight substantive changes intended to clarify the regulations. The revised regulations (310 CMR 10.37, 10.59 and 10.99) eliminate the prior process whereby applicants with projects on the "Estimated Habitat Maps" of rare, state-listed animal species were required to file an "Appendix A" with the state Natural Heritage and Endangered Species Program prior to filing a Notice of Intent (NOI) with the conservation commission. Instead, a copy of the fully completed NOI itself will need to be filed with the Heritage Program (sent in such a manner that delivery will be made within two days of the filing of the NOI with the conservation commission and DEP). This change is designed to save time and paperwork for the applicant, while providing the Heritage Program with more detailed information on the project to assist it in its role of advising commissions on protection of rare species.

Changes in 310 CMR 10.00, and particularly in the 310 CMR 10.99 "General Instructions" for the Notice of Intent, seek to clarify that any project subject to the filing of a Notice of Intent (even such a project in the buffer zone) is required to notify the Heritage Program if it is on the Estimated Habitat Map. The performance standard, which seeks to protect rare species habitat only in wetland resource areas (not buffer zones), would not change. However, the language of the instructions clarifies that it is the conservation commission and DEP (not the applicant) which determines whether a buffer zone project (or any other project) would adversely affect the resource area habitat.

Form Changes. As noted directly above, some revisions have been made in the Notice of Intent, Abbreviated Notice of Intent, and the General Instructions forms (along with the deletion of the Appendix A form) which were necessitated by changes in the rare species procedures (discussed directly above). In addition, forms found in 310 CMR 10.99 may look slightly different from the previous versions, particularly due to deletion of logos from the tops of some forms, as well as changes in type faces, and pagination. This was necessitated by our transferring the forms to a computer format. However, there have been no substantive changes to the forms except for those referred to in the first sentence of this paragraph.



RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENTS RELATIVE TO 1992 TECHNICAL CHANGES  
TO THE WETLANDS PROTECTION ACT REGULATIONS (310 CMR 10.00)

NOTE: The following Response to Public Comments does not form a part of the Wetlands Protection Act Regulations (310 CMR 10.00).

Introduction. In February, 1992, the Department of Environmental Protection proposed a number of revisions to the Wetlands Protection Act Regulations (310 CMR 10.00). Because certain of these revisions could arguably result in a weakening of specific, existing regulatory standards, the Department filed an Environmental Notification Form (ENF) as required under the Massachusetts Environmental Protection Act (MEPA). Since those revisions were proposed, and the ENF on them filed, the Department has received a great deal of public comment. Based on that comment, the Department intends to promulgate final regulations which are considerably different from those originally proposed. For this reason, the Department has withdrawn the ENF previously filed under MEPA, and plans to refile the ENF with regard to its revised proposals on agriculture and aquaculture, Areas of Critical Environmental Concern, dam safety/lake drawdowns and airport tree clearing. However the new ENF will not cover those proposed regulatory changes which we view as being primarily technical in nature. These technical changes, discussed below, are being promulgated at this time.

Definition of Pond. Public response to the proposed regulatory amendment to redefine pond included comments from 20 communities, three public agencies, five special interest groups, three consultants, seven individuals, and one private company. The majority of comments supported the proposed changes. However a substantial number of comments suggested that the proposed language be further amended.

The proposed amendments contained in the public comments primarily related to the issues of: 1. clarifying the definition of man-made basins which are exempt; 2. defining what is meant by "natural conditions"; 3. redefining "drought"; and 4. clarifying what is meant by "inactive" gravel pits. As a result of these comments, the proposed definition of pond has been further amended in the following respects.

In order to clarify the exemption for "impervious retention basins" originally proposed in subsection (b) of the proposed definition, the exclusive reference to retention basins was eliminated and the proposed language was amended to reference all "impervious man-made basins" be they retention basins or otherwise. This more comprehensive phrase is intended to include those man-made structures which were created for a specific purpose and which were not created to provide all the functions which are provided by natural wetland systems.

Many comments were received referring to the difficulty of determining what is meant by "natural conditions" in the sentence: "Ponds shall contain standing water under natural conditions, except during periods of extended drought". Rather than attempt to further define what is meant by "natural conditions", the proposed language was amended to delete the reference to this phrase. As a result, ponds shall be required to contain water under any conditions except during periods of extended drought. Additional comments were received which suggested changes to the definition of "extended drought". Further research on this point revealed that there is no more acceptable definition of drought than that which exists in the current regulations. As a result, the definition of drought contained in this portion of the regulations was not amended.

In order to clarify the reference of the exclusion of gravel pits contained in subsection (c), this section was further amended to specifically reference "individual gravel pits...". Due to the extensive nature of some graveling operations, this clarification is specifically intended to include those individual gravel pits which, although located on the same property as a larger graveling operation, have been abandoned and inactive for five or more consecutive years.

10.00: continued

Fees. Public comment ran the gamut on this issue, from opposition to lowering of specific fees to proposals to exempt certain projects and parties from fees entirely. Regarding our proposal to lower the fee for new agriculture/aquaculture projects, we believe this is justified for two reasons: a) the majority of such projects are quite small and require a relatively short time for review, and b) the Commonwealth has an interest in reducing unnecessary burdens on an already hard pressed agricultural industry in order to keep farming viable in the state.

Rare Species Procedures. Public comments were overwhelmingly supportive of the proposed deletion of the "Appendix A" and the substitution of submitting a completed Notice of Intent (NOI) to the Natural Heritage & Endangered Species Program when a project is proposed within estimated rare species habitat. A few changes in the regulation as originally proposed were made in response to public comment:

It was clarified that the NOI to be sent to the Heritage Program must include all plans, reports and other materials required to be filed with the conservation commission.

Because of the statutory requirement that hearings on NOIs be held within 21 days and decisions made within 21 days after the hearing, it is impossible to create a perfect procedure for ensuring that the Heritage Program has adequate time to make its determination on rare species without delaying the permitting process. In the final regulations, we allow applicants to send the NOI to the Heritage Program "via the U.S. Postal Service by express or priority mail (or otherwise sent in a manner that guarantees delivery within two days)", so long as evidence of such mailing is included with the NOI submitted to the commission and DEP. This was done to ensure that project proposals are not delayed by the rare species regulatory requirement, while at the same time providing the Heritage Program with adequate time to review rare species impacts. It is important to note that if a project proponent refuses to extend a public hearing in a case where the Heritage Program has not yet issued its determination on rare species at the time of the hearing, the conservation commission is still free to consider the Program's determination if it is received within 21 days after the close of the hearing. Thus a wise applicant will generally agree to a hearing extension, so that he or she can have a chance to respond after the Heritage Program's determination has been received by the commission.

The word "delineated" was deleted in reference to Estimated Habitat Maps because the boundaries of such maps are estimated, and not clearly delineated.

Finally, it was noted in the NOI Instructions that rare species performance standards apply except in Designated Port Areas and where a Variance has been issued.

Prefaces for Former Revisions to Wetland Regulations. Public comment generally supported the concept of our retaining in the regulations the information contained in the Prefaces to past regulatory revisions. It was felt that this information provided invaluable guidance to conservation commissions and applicants alike regarding regulatory intent and interpretation. Therefore, the Preface to the most recent regulatory revisions will always appear at the beginning of the regulations, while the older Prefaces will hereinafter be printed as Appendices to the Regulations.

PREFACE TO 1993 REGULATIONS REGARDING  
NORMAL MAINTENANCE AND IMPROVEMENT OF LAND IN AGRICULTURAL USE

NOTE: The following is a preface to, but does not form a part of, the Wetlands Protection Act Regulations (310 CMR 10.00).

Massachusetts is struggling to preserve both its dwindling agricultural base and its remaining wetlands. Both are threatened. While many agricultural practices are compatible with wetlands protection, some can result in temporary or permanent losses of key wetlands functions, such as flood control and pollution attenuation. The Wetlands Protection Act is intended to ensure that these functions are protected through regulatory review and permitting.

At the same time, because wetlands are such an integral part of many farming operations, requirements for environmental review could significantly reduce their economic viability. The Legislature has recognized the value of preserving agriculture in Massachusetts by including in the Wetlands Protection Act exemptions for normal maintenance and improvement of land in agricultural use, including cropland and pastureland. These exemptions recognize that some farming practices will affect wetlands from time to time.

In an effort to keep these competing interests in balance, the Legislative exemptions are limited to ongoing agricultural operations. That is, if tilling or harvesting is being conducted at the present time in or near wetlands, that work and any current work related to production of that agricultural commodity need not go through regulatory review. At the same time, the Legislature recognized that expanded or new agricultural activities, because they can result in new temporary or permanent impacts to wetlands, should be subject to review to ensure that they are conducted in the most environmentally sound manner possible.

The distinction between ongoing work on or related to land in agricultural production, and agricultural expansion, has not been sufficiently clear to farmers or to conservation commissions. The Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) has attempted to clarify the exemptions through policy. In 1991, the Legislature determined that stronger measures to reduce this confusion were necessary and it enacted legislation directing DEP to develop new, clearer regulations.

In response to that mandate, DEP has adopted the following regulations. They make it clear that normal maintenance and improvement of land in agricultural use is exempt from the Wetlands Protection Act and is not subject to regulations adopted pursuant to the Act - provided that the activities fall within the newly-adopted definitions. No Determination of Applicability is required for exempt activities; however, the Determination of Applicability process is intended for use when there is doubt as to whether or not an activity is exempt. Nothing in 310 CMR 10.00 changes the need to independently evaluate whether permits are required under federal laws such as Sections 401 and 404 of the Clean Water Act.

310 CMR 10.00 represents the collective input of dozens of farmers, environmentalists, many state and federal agencies, advocacy groups, and other concerned citizens. Most notable in this process were the efforts of the Farmland Advisory Committee, established by the legislation as an ongoing advisory body, and the Joint Committee on Agriculture and the Environment. These groups worked diligently with DEP and the Department of Food & Agriculture (DFA) to develop regulations that are sensitive to the needs of farmers while preserving valuable wetlands.

DEP believes that, while the appropriate regulatory balance has been achieved, the regulations cannot be specific enough to address all circumstances. Everyone involved in developing 310 CMR 10.00 believes that

their successful implementation will depend largely on continuing efforts to provide education and outreach to conservation commissions and the agricultural community, as well as a good measure of common sense applied by all concerned.

10.00: continued

310 CMR 10.00 refers to a cooperative process in which certain projects can proceed only if the proponent has prepared a farm Conservation Plan approved by the United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service (SCS). This process requires cooperation between the Department and SCS, and that cooperation is formalized by a written Memorandum of Understanding between the two agencies. Copies of the Memorandum of Understanding can be obtained from the Department.

In order to ensure that 310 CMR 10.00 achieves its goals, the Secretary of Environmental Affairs added conditions in her ENF Certificate (EOEA #9266) requiring DEP and the Department of Food and Agriculture (DFA) to convene an independent monitoring committee. DEP and DFA will chair a group of representatives of the agricultural and environmental communities to oversee the implementation of 310 CMR 10.00, to monitor the effects on both wetlands and agriculture in the Commonwealth, and to provide recommendations for possible further revisions at the end of a three year period.

This committee will evaluate cumulative impacts of exempt activities. The Committee should develop a system for gathering information by which it can assess the cumulative impacts of activities such as those listed at 310 CMR 10.04(Agriculture)(c)(1) (b, c, d, e, and g). Such a system could include, for example, notice from farmers that certain activities have been conducted.

PREFACE TO WETLANDS REGULATORY REVISIONS EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1, 1994  
REGARDING LANDFILL CLOSURES, AIRPORT SAFETY, DAM SAFETY, WATER  
SUPPLY DEVELOPMENT, CLEANUP OF OIL & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS,  
AND EMERGENCY CERTIFICATION PROCEDURES  
310 CMR 10.00

*NOTE: The following is a preface to, but does not form a part of, the Wetlands Protection Act Regulations (310 CMR 10.00).*

The Department of Environmental Protection has promulgated regulations creating five new "limited projects". All five have in common the fact that the types of projects covered are, by nature, important to the protection of public health, safety and/or the environment. The five new provisions apply to projects designed to promote, respectively, closure of solid waste landfills, airport safety, dam safety, development of safe drinking water supplies from groundwater, and cleanup of releases of oil and hazardous materials.

The purpose of the new regulations is to ensure that such projects, insofar as is practicable: avoid adverse impacts on wetland resource areas, and where avoidance is not practicable, minimize and mitigate such impacts.

Prior to the effective date of these new limited projects (January 1, 1994), such projects, if not able to meet normal Wetlands Protection Act regulatory standards, were required to obtain a variance from the Commissioner of the Department -- a more expensive and time consuming procedure than the normal Notice of Intent procedure. Establishment of limited project status means returning to the local conservation commissions the authority to review and condition these types of projects.

EMERGENCY CERTIFICATIONS  
(310 CMR 10.06(5))

The Department has made revisions to Emergency Certification procedures, some of which affect only projects to contain and clean up spills of oil and/or hazardous materials (OHM). These are discussed in the OHM section of this preface, below. The Department also has changed an important Emergency Certification provision which applies to all emergency projects, not just OHM sites (310 CMR 10.06(5)). This change specifically gives the Department the authority to review denials and failures to act by conservation commissions on requests for emergency certification. This regulatory revision simply reflects the existing statutory right that exists under the Wetlands Protection Act:

"If the conservation commission ... fail(s) to act favorably within 24 hours of receipt of a request for certification of an emergency project, said project may be so certified by the commissioner (of DEP) or his designee."

LANDFILL CLOSURE LIMITED PROJECT  
(310 CMR 10.24(7)(c)(4) and 10.53(3)(p))

This new limited project is designed to facilitate the closure of landfills adjacent to wetlands while ensuring that wetland impacts are avoided or minimized. The limited project regulation contains a detailed list of conditions for eligibility. Landfill closures eligible for limited project status are restricted to those mandated by the Department of Environmental Protection in accordance with the requirements of 310 CMR 19.00. Limited project provisions do not apply to the construction of new landfills or to the expansion or modification of existing landfills. In addition, a DEP policy has been adopted to establish an internal review procedure for evaluating landfill closure alternatives to ensure that wetland resource area impacts are, to the extent practicable, avoided and, to the extent such impacts cannot be avoided, minimized and mitigated. Copies of the policy can be obtained from the Department's Division of Wetlands & Waterways, One Winter Street, Boston, MA 02108.

Preface: continued

**AIRPORT SAFETY/VEGETATION REMOVAL LIMITED PROJECT**  
(310 CMR 10.24(7)(c)(5) and 10.53(3)(n))

This new limited project covers tree clearing around airports and is intended to allow selective vegetation management in wetland resource areas for maintenance of safe airport landing zones. Activities under this limited project provision are limited to those required to be undertaken in order to comply with certain regulations of the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). The provision does not apply to the construction of new airport facilities or to the expansion of existing airport uses that alter wetlands. A five year vegetation management plan must be included in the Notice of Intent.

In order to ensure that minimal wetland impacts will result from this type of project, a Generic Environmental Impact Report (GEIR) was prepared by the Massachusetts Aeronautics Commission and Massport (Final Generic Environmental Impact Report for Vegetation Removal in Wetlands at Public Use Airports, EOEA No. 8978, August 31, 1993). The GEIR presents substantial information regarding this class of projects and should be used to supplement the limited project regulation in order to identify the types of information to be provided in a Notice of Intent and the types of conditions that should be incorporated into the Orders of Conditions for applicable projects. Conservation Commissions and applicants are especially encouraged to refer to the GEIR's "WETLAND IMPACT EVALUATION CHECKLIST for vegetation removal at airports" found in Chapter 6 of the GEIR. Copies of the GEIR can be obtained from the Massachusetts Aeronautics Commission, 10 Park Plaza, Room 6620, Boston, MA 02116-3966.

The Massachusetts Secretary of Environmental Affairs has certified that the GEIR "adequately and properly complies with the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act" and regulations. In that certification, however, the Secretary required that "the DEP, along with Massport and the MAC (Mass. Aeronautics Commission), prepare and file a new Generic Environmental Notification Form (ENF) in two years.... The objective of that ENF will be to evaluate the effectiveness of this new provision, and to provide all those involved with the opportunity to evaluate it based on actual field experience."

The Secretary went on to say in her certification that the GEIR did not deal adequately with the idea of mitigation banking and that this issue should be dealt with in much greater depth in the next GEIR. The Commonwealth has since initiated a feasibility study of wetlands banking. For this reason, the limited project just promulgated does not now include mitigation banking in its list of possible mitigation measures to be considered by project applicants.

**PUBLIC GROUNDWATER SUPPLY LIMITED PROJECT**  
(310 CMR 10.53(3)(o))

This new limited project is designed to permit the development of safe public drinking water supplies from groundwater, while ensuring that wetland impacts are avoided or minimized. Except for exploration projects, eligibility for limited project status is restricted to projects approved by the Department of Environmental Protection in accordance with the provisions of the Public Water Supply Source Approval Process pursuant to 310 CMR 22.21 and/or the Water Management Act, M.G.L. c. 21G. A DEP policy has been adopted to establish an internal review procedure for evaluating water supply development alternatives to ensure that wetland resource impacts are, to the extent practicable, avoided and, to the extent such impacts cannot be avoided, minimized and mitigated. Copies of the policy can be obtained from the Department's Division of Wetlands & Waterways, One Winter Street, Boston, MA 02108.

**DAM SAFETY/LAKE DRAWDOWN LIMITED PROJECT**  
(310 CMR 10.53(3)(i) & (m))

The purpose of this limited project is to provide a reasonable balance between dam safety and wetland protection interests, and to ensure that safety-related "drawdowns" of water levels in dammed impoundments do not drain wetlands for any longer a period than necessary. This has been accomplished in two ways.



Preface: continued

First, the existing limited project for maintenance, repair and improvement of "structures" (310 CMR 10.53(3)(i)) has been amended to specifically include dams and reservoirs. Both drawdowns and refilling of dams pursuant to dam repair are now covered. Second, a new limited project (310 CMR 10.53(3)(m)) has been created for drawdowns that occur in response to orders or other recommendations from the Department of Environmental Management's Office of Dam Safety (DEM).

In extreme emergency situations, DEM orders immediate drawdown of water levels to protect public safety. Such drawdowns are statutorily authorized to occur without prior filing of a Notice of Intent (M.G.L. c. 253, §§ 44 through 50). More commonly, however, DEM tries to identify unsafe dams well in advance of the point where they pose an imminent threat. When DEM identifies such an unsafe dam, it usually sends a request to the dam owner to "certify as to the safety" of the dam. These DEM "recommendation letters" usually include recommended response actions, but they do not order any specific response action, such as dam repair. In response, dam owners generally seek to draw down water levels to lessen stress on the dam. However, drawdowns made in response to DEM "recommendation letters" may not be undertaken without first filing a Notice of Intent and receiving an Order of Conditions.

Such drawdowns clearly "alter" wetlands and frequently alter more than 5,000 square feet of bordering vegetated wetland. Particularly if the drawdowns are allowed to continue for extended periods, they can result in significant adverse impacts. Yet drawdowns are often critical for dam safety purposes. For this reason, the new wetlands limited project has been established to allow drawdowns made in response to DEM "Orders" and "Recommendation Letters" to occur in two circumstances:

1. Where the drawdown is to occur for a limited time in order to render the dam safe until repairs can be made. In this circumstance, DEM has agreed in a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with DEP to issue a finding, on a case by case basis, establishing a reasonable period of time in which the drawdown and repair are to be completed. Such a finding by the DEM Office of Dam Safety should be included by the applicant with a Notice of Intent for this type of project.
2. Where DEM has found that the drawdown is necessary for public safety, and that it is not economically feasible at the time of such finding to repair the dam. Again, DEM has agreed in its MOU with DEP to issue such findings in writing, and to send copies to the conservation commission and DEP. DEM will generally find repair to be infeasible when the cost of the repair exceeds the value of the property containing the dam, except where the dam owner derives other financial benefits from the dam. DEM also has agreed in its MOU with DEP to issue a "superseding" finding of economic feasibility upon request of any person, organization, or agency if warranted by changed circumstances (e.g., change in dam ownership, commitment by another person or group to finance the repair in whole or in part, etc.). When a DEM finding of economic infeasibility has been issued, conservation commissions may grant an Order of Conditions for up to three years for the drawdown, and may extend or reissue an Order as many times as necessary so long as repair continues to be economically infeasible.

This limited project provision should ensure that all drawdowns related to dam safety are permissible under 310 CMR 10.00, while limiting their duration to the time it takes to repair the dam, unless such repair is economically infeasible.

By establishing this limited project, the Department hopes to create a clear mechanism whereby both dam owners and third parties are encouraged to take all reasonable actions to alleviate adverse impacts from dam safety-related water level drawdowns.

**LIMITED PROJECT AND EMERGENCY CERTIFICATION PROCEDURES FOR  
RESPONSE ACTIONS TO RELEASES OF OIL AND/OR HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**  
(310 CMR 10.06(3) & (7), 10.24(7)(c)(6), and 10.53(3)(q))

On July 31, 1993, the Department issued a new set of regulations governing cleanups of oil and/or hazardous materials (OHM) (310 CMR 40.0000). The

## 310 CMR: DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Department now has revised its Wetlands Protection Act Regulations (310 CMR 10.00) to provide greater consistency and ease of administration in applying 310 CMR 40.0000 and 310 CMR 10.00 while ensuring that the interests of the Wetlands Protection Act are protected to the greatest extent practicable. (A short summary of 310 CMR 40.0000 is available from the Department's Division of Wetlands and Waterways, One Winter Street, Boston, MA 02108.)

## Preface: continued

The Department has adopted a new wetlands "limited project" for OHM release response actions that are necessary to protect health, safety, public welfare, and/or the environment, but that cannot meet current wetland regulatory standards without obtaining a variance. Standards for the limited project are similar to, though considerably more detailed than, the Wetlands variance standards.

The Department also has amended the Wetlands emergency procedures as they relate to remediation of OHM spills in order to ensure that these procedures don't result in unnecessary delays and exacerbation of critical toxic pollution problems.

*New Wetlands Regulation Limited Project for Oil and/or Hazardous Materials Release Response Actions*

Because cleanups of oil and/or hazardous material (OHM) releases are critical for the protection of health, safety, public welfare, and the environment, the Department believes that they should be allowed to go forward so long as, to the maximum extent practicable: adverse impacts to wetlands are avoided and, to the extent this is not possible, such adverse impacts are minimized and mitigated.

310 CMR 40.0000 gives responsible parties (RPs) a number of alternatives for dealing with oil and hazardous material releases. Immediate Response Actions (IRAs) are generally required to be implemented on an emergency basis, and thus would normally be reviewed under the emergency certification provisions of the Wetland Regulations (see discussion of emergency certifications in this Preface, below).

Any other measure implemented pursuant to 310 CMR 40.0000 that can meet normal Wetland regulatory performance standards will continue to be governed by those standards and will not be eligible for limited project status. Furthermore, any measure undertaken pursuant to 310 CMR 40.0000 that is not needed to eliminate significant risk to health, safety, public welfare or the environment (*i.e.*, measures designed solely to reach "background" levels of pollution) will not be eligible for limited project status (see the language in parentheses in the first paragraph of 310 CMR 10.24(7)(c)(6) and 10.53(3)(q)).

Limited project status may be needed, however, for response actions such as Release Abatement Measures (RAMs), even though they are designed for relatively minor levels of contamination. RAMs can have large wetland impacts: *e.g.*, diverting contaminated ground or surface water in a manner that drains wetlands, building an access road through a wetland in order to reach a work site, *etc.* It should be noted that RAMs -- and all other remediation and containment measures except IRAs and Comprehensive Response Actions (described in the next paragraph) -- are not mandated, although they are allowed, by 310 CMR 40.0000.

Only Comprehensive Response Actions (CRAs) -- and not RAMs or other remedial actions -- are required under 310 CMR 40.0000 to be selected on the basis of an alternatives analysis that gives significant consideration to wetland impacts. Therefore, selection of the particular CRA technology or methodology (*e.g.*, pump and treat, dredge and fill, *etc.*) may be made without performing the additional alternatives analysis normally required under provisions of 310 CMR 10.24(7)(c)6.a. and 10.53(3)(q)1. However, the design, construction, implementation, and operation of all OHM-related limited projects, including CRAs, RAMs, *etc.*, must meet specific performance standards, including maximum practicable avoidance, minimization and mitigation of adverse wetland impacts (see 310 CMR 10.24(7)(c)6.b. and 10.53(3)(q)2.).

Finally, it is important to note that since only the most seriously contaminated sites will have BWSC oversight, the language of the limited project gives conservation commissions and the DEP Wetlands Program the authority to deny limited project status for any proposed project that clearly does not comply with 310 CMR 40.0000. Needless to say, such a conclusion will generally be very difficult to reach for persons who don't have considerable expertise in oil or

hazardous materials issues, and the Department does not anticipate that claims of compliance with the standards of 310 CMR 40.0000 will be rejected by conservation commissions or the Wetlands Program in many cases. The Wetlands Program does intend, however, to work with DEP's Bureau of Waste Site Cleanup to examine projects applying for limited project status if it has reason to believe the project was not selected or designed in compliance with 310 CMR 40.0000.

Preface: continued

*Revisions in Wetland Emergency Procedures Regarding Releases of OHM*

310 CMR 40.0000 allows certain Immediate Response Actions (IRAs) to commence prior to written approval, and in some cases up to 24 hours before oral approval from BWSC, "where the delay involved in notifying and obtaining approval from the Department would substantially exacerbate release or site conditions or endanger health, safety, public welfare or the environment." Consequently, the revised regulations state (see revisions to 310 CMR 10.06(7)) that projects in these two categories shall be given up to 48 hours (but never more than 24 hours after BWSC has orally approved commencement of the work) to make a request for a Wetlands Emergency Certification with the conservation commission. Work on these types of projects is allowed to continue pending a decision on the request for Emergency Certification by the conservation commission or the DEP Wetlands Program on appeal. In cases where a conservation commission denies, or fails to act within 24 hours of a requests for Emergency Certification for these types of projects, the DEP Wetlands Program will review requests for emergency certification and issue a decision within seven days. It should be noted, however, that all of these types of emergency projects will have received at least oral approval from the Department's Bureau of Waste Site Cleanup within 24 hours of commencement.

Immediate Response Actions which are not so urgent as to be eligible for oral approval from BWSC are not be covered by the special provisions stated in the preceding paragraph. However, all emergency certifications granted for Immediate Response Actions are valid for up to 60 days, rather than the 30 day maximum for non-hazardous waste emergency projects (see revisions to 310 CMR 10.06(3)). The Department is doing this to make the Wetland Protection Act Regulations more consistent with 310 CMR 40.0000, and to encourage quick OHM clean-ups without excessive process.

To determine whether, and under what conditions, the Department's Bureau of Waste Site Cleanup (BWSC) has given written or oral approval to an Immediate Response Action, conservation commissions can call DEP's BWSC release notification unit the appropriate DEP regional office. If that office is closed, a person from that unit can be paged by calling the Massachusetts State Police at 617-566-4500. The current phone numbers for the Department's regional offices are: Northeast: 617-935-2160; Southeast: 508-946-2700; Central: 508-792-7650; and Western: 413-784-1100.